

AD-A196 475

2

DTIC FILE COPY

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: Perceptions by Army Junior Noncommissioned Officers and their Spouses of the Impact of Leader Power and Behavior on their Family Well-being

Keith Douglas Emberton, Master of Arts, 1988

Thesis directed by: Professor Mady W. Segal
Department of Sociology

DTIC
SELECTED
JUN 14 1988
S D

— This paper investigates the perceptions of soldiers and spouses of the impact that leader power and behavior have on their family well-being. The perceptions are based on interviews conducted in June 1987 of 23 respondents. A qualitative analysis of interview responses is performed using Blau's structural exchange theory to provide an understanding of soldier and spouse perceptions. The analysis draws upon leadership theory, as well as research in the sociology of work and family, including military families. The analysis is organized into components from Blau's theory, and incorporates vignettes of respondent statements to exemplify the utility of the theory. The discussion includes a synopsis of the main points learned from applying Blau's theory to the social exchange relationships among leaders, soldiers, and families, as well as a typology of soldier and spouse perceptions of their leaders' behavior, and its impact on family well-being. Among conclusions presented, leader power and behavior is per-

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

ceived to have a positive impact on family well-being when there is reciprocity in exchange between leaders and soldiers or spouses, when soldier and spouse expectations are fulfilled, and when leaders use reward power or show consideration. Conversely, a negative impact on family well-being is perceived when there is a lack of reciprocity in exchange, when expectations are not fulfilled, and when leaders use coercive power or show a lack of consideration toward soldiers or spouses.

*Improves military leadership:
Family members; families (summa), spouses,
1st. relations; etc.*

Accession For	
NTIS - CRASH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
USAF - T&E	<input type="checkbox"/>
USAF - J&E	<input type="checkbox"/>
by <i>perltr</i>	
Date	
A-1	



PERCEPTIONS BY ARMY JUNIOR NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS
AND THEIR SPOUSES OF THE IMPACT OF LEADER POWER
AND BEHAVIOR ON THEIR FAMILY WELL-BEING

by

Keith Douglas Emberton

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of The University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
1988

Advisory Committee:

Professor Mady W. Segal (Chair)
Professor Barbara F. Meeker
Professor David R. Segal

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to foremost acknowledge my mentors, Mady W. Segal and David R. Segal, for their outstanding guidance, sharing of their profound expertise in military sociology, and tremendous amount of time spent assisting me throughout the writing of the thesis. I also wish to gratefully acknowledge my committee member, Barbara F. Meeker, especially for the sharing of her broad expertise in social exchange theory.

I am also greatly indebted to Jocelyn S. Vuozzo, from the University of Maryland and the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, and Sergeant Gary Killebrew, from the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, for their valuable assistance and guidance before and during the interview process.

Furthermore, my appreciation is extended to some other special individuals who played a key role in assisting me during the early formulation of conceptual aspects pertaining to the thesis. They are: Jay Stanley and Sandra C. Stanley, from the Department of Sociology at Towson State University; and Lieutenant Colonel Paul Furukawa and Joel Teitelbaum, from the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter I - Introduction	1
Purpose and Scope	1
Research Questions	1
Chapter II - Theory	5
Blau's Structural Exchange Theory	5
Leader Power and Behavior	17
Chapter III - Work and Family Research	25
Work and Family Well-Being	25
Military Families	28
Chapter IV - Method	38
The Interview	38
Qualitative Analysis Plan	41
Chapter V - Analysis of Interview Responses	45
Chapter VI - Discussion and Conclusion	89
Discussion	89
Conclusion	97
References	101

Chapter I - Introduction

Purpose and Scope

This thesis studies soldier and spouse perceptions of the impact of leader power and behavior on military family well-being. The purpose of the thesis is to contribute knowledge about soldier and spouse perceptions to an existing body of research in the sociology of work and family, including research on military families. The thesis utilizes portions of Blau's (1964) structural exchange theory in order to analyze qualitatively interview responses which capture the perceptions. It also selectively draws upon relevant theory in leader power and behavior, and relevant research in the sociology of work and family, and military families, to support the analysis.

The scope of research provided by this thesis concerns married junior noncommissioned officers and their spouses. The research is based upon interviews which were conducted in a family housing area at a large U.S. Army post in the South in June 1987. The interview questions were aimed at assessing the perceptions of respondents about their leaders' power and behavior, and their family well-being. More specific information about the interview and respondents are discussed in a later chapter of the thesis.

Research Questions

Studying the perceptions of the impact of leader power and behavior on military family well-being represents a new

addition to existing research on the relationship between work and family, including military families. Research questions have been formulated to guide the building of knowledge. Correspondingly, the thesis focuses upon addressing these questions. Before presenting them, however, the usage of the term "well-being" will be clarified.

The concept of well-being is often equated with quality of life and degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Frequently it is used to describe the opportunity for "personal growth, self-fulfillment, and self-esteem" (Schuessler and Fisher, 1985, p. 131). As it is used in the research questions below, a sense of well-being refers to the domain-specific satisfaction with the quality of family life (Campbell, 1981). Well-being comprises elements of both mental life, i.e., attitudes and feelings; and environmental life, i.e., shelter and surroundings (Schuessler and Fisher, 1985).

Given this understanding of well-being, the major questions to be addressed by this thesis are:

1. What are soldier and spouse perceptions of the impact of their unit leaders' power and behavior on their family's well-being?
2. To what degree and in what ways is unit leader power and behavior perceived as impacting on military family well-being?

The component questions to be addressed are:

1a. Exchange Principles. In what ways might Blau's implicit social exchange principles explain soldier and spouse perceptions of the exchange relationship between leaders and soldiers?

1b. Exchange Principles and Family Well-being. Based on soldier and spouse perceptions, how might Blau's exchange principles account for the exchange relationships between either leaders and spouses or soldiers and spouses?

2. Rewards and Compliance. How might Blau's conceptualization of the exchange of rewards for compliance with leader demands account for soldier and spouse perceptions of exchange relationships between unit leaders and soldiers? How is family well-being affected?

3. Power and Sanctions. How does Blau's description of leader power and sanctions explain soldier and spouse perceptions of exchange relationships between unit leaders and soldiers? How is family well-being affected?

4a. Norms of Exchange: Reciprocity and Fairness. How might Blau's conceptualization of the norms of reciprocity and fairness in exchange account for soldier and spouse perceptions of integration in the exchange relationship between leaders and soldiers? How is family well-being affected?

4b. Violations of the Norms of Exchange. How does Blau's conceptualization of violations of the norms of

reciprocity and fairness in exchange account for soldier and spouse perceptions of conflict in the exchange relationship between unit leaders and soldiers? How is family well-being affected?

5. Values and Expectations. How might Blau's view of followers' values and expectations of social rewards explain soldier and spouse perceptions of the exchange relationship between unit leaders and soldiers? How is family well-being affected?

As shown by the questions, the relationship between leader power/behavior and military family well-being will be analyzed using an exchange theory perspective. The next chapter outlines selected principles of Blau's structural exchange theory so that it can be applied to the relationship between leader power/behavior and military family well-being.

Chapter II - Theory

Blau's Structural Exchange Theory

The structural exchange theory of Peter M. Blau is used in this thesis to explain soldier and spouse perceptions of the impact of their unit leaders' power and behavior on their family well-being. Blau's theory is particularly well suited for application to this thesis because it combines social exchange, functional, and conflict perspectives, and provides insight into social processes ranging from micro to macro. For these reasons, Blau's theory would account for the dynamics in the exchange relationship between leaders and soldiers, leaders and spouses, and soldiers and spouses. These exchange dynamics, as discussed by Blau in Exchange and Power in Social Life, include: rewards and compliance, power and sanctions, norms of exchange, violations of the norms of exchange, plus values and expectations of social rewards (Blau, 1964).

Other social exchange theories come close to the degree of appropriateness that Blau's theory has to this study, but do not quite match it. The exchange theories which stand in contrast to Blau's theory are those of George C. Homans, J.W. Thibaut and H.H. Kelley, and Richard M. Emerson. Homans explicitly specifies six principles of exchange which approximate the implicit exchange principles discussed by Blau (Homans, 1961). However, Homans' theory employs a reductionist model, i.e., using patterns of human interac-

tion, activity, and sentiment to generate an explanation for higher-order constructs such as norms and power, while Blau employs a constructivist model, i.e., using higher-order constructs to explain human interaction, which is more appropriate to this study (Homans, 1950; Shaw and Costanzo, 1982).

Thibaut and Kelley's social exchange theory was concerned explicitly with the behavior, social interactions and exchanges of small groups (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959), and for this reason was not as applicable to this study as Blau's theory, which considers processes beyond the scope of the small group. Furthermore, Emerson's exchange theory focuses on meso-level social structure as well as forms of relationships rather than micro-level exchange processes (Emerson, 1976), which are important processes in this study that are accounted for by Blau's theory.

As mentioned, Blau's theory accounts for the dynamics in the direct relationship between leaders and soldiers, as well as the few direct encounters between leaders and spouses. However, soldiers' spouses are indirectly involved in the relationship between the soldiers and their leaders to a greater or lesser extent depending on the family. Through the process of social exchange between soldiers and their spouses, and through living together and experiencing military demands on their families, spouses are affected by leader power and behavior.

The sections to follow will briefly present portions of Blau's theory which apply to the relationship between leaders and military families. As the theory is presented, various aspects of leader power and behavior and demands on military families will be discussed. Following this section, relevant theory in leader power and behavior, and relevant research in the sociology of work and family, and military families, will be presented to provide a greater understanding of soldier and spouse perceptions.

Social Exchange

Blau, like other exchange theorists, holds that behaviors in social exchange relationships are oriented toward rewards or goals, and involve choosing an action among alternatives which will produce the reward or goal (Blau, 1964). Soldiers are participants in such exchange relationships, and are oriented to work for rewards or goals, some of which leaders provide for them. Research conducted by March and Simon exemplifies this exchange process by showing that individuals and groups within organizations receive from organizational leaders inducements, and in turn offer the organization contributions (March and Simon, 1958).

Inducements are in the form of leader services and rewards rendered to soldiers. Contributions are in the form of work done for the organization which often is independent of the self-interest of the soldier or leader (March and

Simon, 1958; Blau, 1964). Social exchange relationships also enable individuals who provide rewards to receive rewards in return as just recompense (Blau, 1964). Leaders receive rewards from soldiers in the form of mission accomplishment, being well liked, through expressed soldier satisfaction with unit programs, or indirectly through awards and promotions made possible by the contributions of their soldiers, all of which ostensibly enhance a leader's effectiveness.

Exchange Principles

Blau's implicit principles of social exchange can be applied to the dynamics in the relationship between leaders and soldiers. He states that "if both individuals value what they receive from the other, both are prone to supply more of their own services to provide incentives for the other to increase his supply ..." (Blau, 1964, p. 90). This might be referred to as the reinforcement principle. Applying this principle to the Army leads to the expectation that soldiers will probably be more motivated to perform when there is a strong incentive provided by the leader.

Blau also holds that the more people exchange rewards with each other, the greater the likelihood of subsequent reciprocal obligations and exchanges between them. We might call this the subsequent exchange principle. Conversely, the more reciprocal obligations are violated, the greater the likelihood that the deprived party will initiate

negative sanctions against the other party (Blau, 1964).

Another principle Blau puts forth, which can be referred to as the reciprocity principle, is that the more exchange relations are sustained, the more likely they are to be regulated by fairness in the exchange. Fairness or legitimacy refers to the extent that something is reasonable, just, and in accordance with standards. As the norms of fair exchange are violated, the deprived individuals are likely to "feel angry as well as dissatisfied and give vent to their anger through disapproval of and sometimes hostility and hatred against" those violating the norms (Blau, 1964, p. 157). According to Blau, feelings of relative deprivation occur when individuals are dissatisfied not by their own absolute rewards but in comparison to more highly rewarded others (Blau, 1964).

Blau addresses two further principles of social exchange. One, which may be called the principle of marginal utility, states that the more frequently specific rewards are received for performing an activity, the less valuable the reward, the less valuable the activity becomes, and the less likely the activity will be performed (Blau, 1964). An application of this idea to leader-soldier relations would lead us to expect that leaders who too often reward soldiers with particular rewards are decreasing the likelihood that the performance will be repeated. For example, the more medals that are given, the less the

medals are worth, and the less the activity which produced the medals will be performed.

The other principle, which may be labeled the imbalance principle, proposes that as exchange relations between some individuals become increasingly stable and balanced, "the same forces that restore balance or equilibrium in one respect are imbalancing or disequilibrating forces" in other exchange relations (Blau, 1964, p. 7). Therefore, it is expected that imbalances will result when leaders must trade off stability in their relations with one group of soldiers for strain in their relations with another group.

Exchange Principles and Family Well-being

Family well-being involves soldier and spouse satisfaction with their family life, and includes elements of their attitudes and feelings, and perceptions of their environment. Spouse perceptions of leader impact on family well-being may result from their direct exchange relationships with unit leaders, or from the soldier-spouse exchange relationship. In the instances where spouses have direct exchange with leaders, which might be at unit-sponsored family support group meetings, unit social events, or through telephone calls, the exchange is governed by the subsequent exchange principle and reciprocity principle in a fashion similar to the exchange between leaders and soldiers (Blau, 1964). As a result of direct contact with leaders, the spouse develops attitudes and feelings about leader

power and behavior that contribute to perceptions about leader impact on family well-being.

Since spouse interactions with unit leaders are generally minimal, spouse perceptions of unit leader impact on family well-being result mainly from the exchange relationship between the soldier and spouse. Presumably, when the soldier exchanges feelings with the spouse of either approval, disapproval or anger about the leader's power or behavior, often the spouse will offer the reward of agreement and share in the soldier's perceptions of the leader's positive or negative impact on family well-being. The fairness in the exchange of affect in the marital relationship represents an application of the reciprocity principle (Blau, 1964).

Rewards and Compliance

Blau specifies four generic types or classes of rewards which can be bestowed in an exchange relationship: money, social approval, esteem, and compliance (Blau, 1964). He states that the most valuable reward to a leader is compliance with the leader's requests. As a leader provides rewards and inducements to a group, he is able to gain compliance with his demands. Compliance with a leader's demands is particularly important in a military context to insure loyalty and mission accomplishment both in peacetime and in war. It is also worthy of mention that fair demands are likely to be met with soldier approval, while conver-

sely, excessive demands are liable to be met with disapproval (Blau, 1964).

The extent of collective soldier approval of leadership provides legitimacy to leadership. Legitimacy fosters soldier compliance willingly, regardless of whether compliance is in the soldier's personal self-interest. The coordination of effort between leaders and soldiers in turn produces rewards to both in the form of goal accomplishment. As a leader contributes to group goals, the leader commands respect from his soldiers (Blau, 1964). Additionally, soldier satisfaction is likely to be enhanced by approving of the leadership as well as by the accomplishment of the goals.

Individual soldiers and groups of soldiers will also comply with leader directives in order to conform to group norms and avoid social disapproval. At times soldier norms might involve "getting over" on leaders rather than complying with their demands. In most cases, however, the rewards received by soldiers serve as compensation for their instrumental contributions and compliance with leader directives (Blau, 1964). This study will analyze soldiers' perceptions of rewards and compliance with leader demands.

Power and Sanctions

Leaders have power when they obtain compliance in an exchange relationship with their soldiers, or when dependency exists. Power may be defined as the leader's "poten-

tial capacity to influence a target person" (Yukl, 1981, p. 18), or the "probability that [leaders] ... will be in a position to carry out [their] own will despite resistance" (Weber, 1968, p. 53). Leaders possess power because they can give or withhold rewards, impose punishments, or "direct and coordinate the activities of men" (Blau, 1964, p. 199). It is this ability to make and control demands on soldiers which gives leaders power. These demands include long hours, weekend work, and deployment separation, all of which are discussed in the section on military families.

Blau also formulates four propositions specifying the conditions which create the differential in power between individuals. These propositions or alternatives are based on the need an individual has for the services another has to offer. When an individual can either supply another with a service that the other wants badly enough, find the needed service somewhere else, force the other to provide the service, or do without the service, then the other will not have power over him or her (Blau, 1964). However, when an individual cannot fulfill these conditions then a power differential exists between the individuals. Moreover, "providing needed benefits others cannot easily do without is undoubtedly the most prevalent way of attaining power" (Blau, 1964, p. 118).

The relationship between soldiers and leaders is analogous to the latter condition. In military units,

soldiers are dependent upon their leaders for guidance and extrinsic rewards such as safety in maneuvers, logistical support to accomplish a mission, and job security, thereby fostering the power differential between them.

Leader reward and coercive power enables the imposition of positive or negative sanctions, respectively, upon soldiers (French and Raven, 1959). Negative sanctions imposed upon soldiers for failure to comply with leader directives also have the positive effect of making the future cost of obedience a preferable alternative, thereby encouraging obedience. When leaders do not employ coercion, soldiers may choose to noncomply, which may not be unreasonable for them (Blau, 1964). Conceivably, some temporal leader demands, such as requiring soldiers to work after duty hours, are imposed as negative sanctions to encourage timely mission accomplishment on future occasions. Negative sanctions, however, are likely to inhibit soldier satisfaction or create dissatisfaction.

Norms of Exchange (Reciprocity and Fairness) and Violations of the Norms

Blau holds that the differences of power in groups creates both strains toward integration and strains toward conflict (Blau, 1964). Strains toward integration are fostered by the norms of reciprocity and fairness in exchange relations between leaders and soldiers. Integration is also encouraged by legitimate power which backs leader demands for compliance. Fair exchange relations

might specifically involve the exchange of rewards for compliance, social approval, respect, esteem, contributions, or time (Blau, 1964).

Conversely, strains toward opposition are the result of inequality or imbalance in exchange relationships. When imbalances between leaders and soldiers lead to severe violations of the norms of reciprocity and fairness, or when soldiers fail to receive expected rewards, then the result is conflict among individuals involved in an exchange (Blau, 1964). Blau states that "some conflict and opposition are inevitable in large organizations with many specialized subgroups, each of which is interested not only in raising its absolute volume of rewards but also its relative standing among others" (Blau, 1964, p. 220). The extent of integration or conflict is liable to affect soldier satisfaction and well-being. Additionally, it is likely that soldier contributions or compliance at work could increase or decrease when either soldiers or spouses perceive that unit leaders have a positive or negative impact, respectively, on their family well-being.

Values and Expectations

The value of social rewards is based upon acquired standards, individual experiences, or the relative social gratification the rewards bring to an individual. The value a reward has to an individual determines the extent to which it will be sought or the energy expended to achieve it.

Social rewards might include compliance, social approval, etc., or tangible rewards. With regard to rewards, Blau states that (Blau, 1964, p. 159):

Since reference groups serve as standards of comparison and expectation, the average reward received by their members becomes a baseline for evaluating what is relatively gratifying or a relatively depriving experience. Men derive gratification from the amount of money they earn, but they also derive gratification from earning more than their associates and feel deprived if they earn much less, regardless of how high their absolute income is.

By way of illustration, a soldier may value an award because in the past the reward has been esteeming to other soldiers who received it. Alternatively, a reward of time off may be gratifying to a soldier mainly because the free time represents more than other soldiers in similar units receive. It is noteworthy that leaders value social rewards in ways similar to soldiers, based upon standards, experiences, or relative gratification.

Expectations of social rewards, like values, also emanate from past social experiences, acquired social reference standards, or directly from values held by individuals. Blau writes that "the reactions of followers to leader's demands ... are contingent on their normative expectations of how much a leader can fairly demand" (Blau, 1964, p. 204). Therefore, if the demands made on soldiers do not exceed their normative expectations, then they will consider their position advantageous. Alternatively, when

demands exceed expectations, soldiers are liable to feel exploited and oppose the leader's requests. Ultimately, the degree to which soldier expectations are met might impact upon their satisfaction with the job, their job performance, retention, and well-being.

To this point, components of Blau's structural exchange theory have been presented which are relevant to the exchange relationship between either leaders and soldiers, leaders and spouses, or soldiers and spouses. Also bearing upon the substantive nature of this study are relevant aspects of leadership theory pertaining to leader power and behavior. Leadership theory will be selectively utilized to enhance an understanding of soldier and spouse perceptions of their leaders' power and behavior. The next section provides a justification for the incorporation of leadership theory and presents an overview of certain aspects of leader power and leader behavior. It should be kept in mind that Blau's theory will primarily account for the perceptions of the exchange relationships, but to illustrate the leadership dynamics in the exchange, selected aspects of leadership theory will be drawn upon.

Leader Power and Behavior

Leader Power

Among the wide range of theoretical insights and research into leader power, there are certain aspects which are particularly suitable to the substantive content of this

thesis. The most appropriate aspects are traceable to French and Raven's (1959) typology of leader power. French and Raven proposed that there were at least five bases of power utilized by leaders. These bases of power, which will be described below, include: reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert power (French and Raven, 1959).

The description of these forms of power is important to the context of this thesis because it highlights ways in which soldiers and spouses might perceive their leaders as impacting upon them and their families. For instance, the granting of time off to soldiers by leaders, which implies the leaders' exercise of reward power with soldiers, is a way in which soldiers might state that their leaders have a positive impact on their family well-being. The remaining bases of power might explain soldier or spouse perceptions of other ways leaders have an impact, as well. Furthermore, drawing upon the French and Raven typology, examples can be derived of how each base of power might relate to leaders in the military.

One form of power, reward power, is based on an individual's perception that a leader is able to provide rewards for him or her. Reward power primarily depends on the leader's ability to control rewards and withdraw or decrease punishment (French and Raven, 1959). Leaders commonly offer rewards or incentives explicitly or implicitly to individuals to encourage their contributions or

compliance. The likelihood of compliance is greatest when leader requests are perceived by the individual as attractive, feasible, and legitimate (Yukl, 1981; Jacobs, 1970; Bass, 1981). Leaders in the military might offer incentives to soldiers to encourage the timely and satisfactory accomplishment of a mission, and then provide them with a reward, such as time off or something else of value, upon completion.

Another form of power, coercive power, is based on an individual's perception that a leader has the ability to punish him or her. Moreover, the individual will often offer compliance to avoid punishment. Coercive power involves leaders' ability to control the imposition of punishment (French and Raven, 1959). Leader use of coercive power is usually effective in maintaining discipline, and also when used on a small percentage of the membership of an organization in a way perceived to be legitimate (Yukl, 1981; Kahn et al., 1964).

In addition, when leaders use coercive power, their supervision of soldiers often helps insure compliance (Jacobs, 1970). Military leaders frequently use coercive power as a means of building discipline or insuring future compliance in their unit when soldiers fail to offer satisfactory instrumental contributions or efforts at work. Moreover, the threat of punishment often is utilized by leaders to encourage soldiers to comply with regulations,

such as reporting to duty on time or maintaining accountability of their equipment (French and Snyder, 1959).

Legitimate power is a third form used by leaders, and is based on an individual's perception that a leader has the right to direct his or her behavior (French and Raven, 1959). Additionally, legitimate power implies that an individual has an obligation to comply (Yukl, 1981). This form of power is also "derived from a consensus of group members that the observed influence attempt [by the leader] is reasonable and correct ... i.e., behavior expected of a person in the position ..." (Jacobs, 1970, p. 224). Some bases of a leader's legitimate power might be occupancy of a position, or designation and appointment by the represented group membership (Bass, 1981). In military units, leader legitimate power is based upon the formal leadership position occupied, as well as upon the differential in rank between leaders and soldiers (French and Snyder, 1959).

The next form of power, referent power, is based upon an individual's identification with a leader, admiration for a leader, or attraction to a leader. The leader possesses the ability to influence an individual because of the individual's desire to identify with the leader (French and Raven, 1959). An individual might also comply with a leader to receive approval, or through loyalty which has developed over time. Leaders who show consideration toward individuals

are likely to possess greater referent power (Yukl, 1981; Jacobs, 1970). Soldiers are likely to comply with their leaders' orders out of identification and loyalty to the leaders. Furthermore, leaders who show consideration toward their soldiers usually encourage their soldiers to be more loyal and dedicated.

The remaining form of power in the typology is expert power. Expert power is based upon one's perception that his or her leader possesses special knowledge. This knowledge can be relative to the individual's own or compared to an absolute standard. The leader who uses expert power influences primarily the perceptions of individuals. Trust and credibility of the leader is an important basis for, and result of, a leader's use of expert power (French and Raven, 1959). Individuals who perceive leaders as having expert power usually respect their judgment as well (Kahn et al., 1964). Military leaders routinely influence soldier perceptions of their knowledge through the use of expert power by demonstrating technical competence. Also, expert power is an effective medium through which leaders enhance their credibility among soldiers by gaining soldier trust in their competence.

The five forms of power serve as a means by which leaders explicitly or implicitly use power to achieve designated ends. This typology will account for and lend understanding to soldier and spouse perceptions of the ways

leader power impacts upon their family well-being. Besides leader power, there are distinct aspects within the theories of leader behavior that are relevant to the content of this thesis. These aspects, which represent groupings of leader behaviors, are leader consideration and initiating structure.

Leader Behavior

Basically, consideration involves leader relationship oriented behaviors, while initiating structure includes leader task oriented behaviors (Halpin and Winer, 1957). These aspects of leader behavior are of import because they can be used to describe and understand soldier and spouse perceptions of leader behavior and its impact on family well-being. The aspects of leader consideration and initiating structure are described briefly below along with an explanation of how they might relate to military leadership.

One dimension or grouping of leader behavior, leader consideration, represents behaviors in which the leader is "likely to have job relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas, and consideration for their feelings" (Csoka, 1984, p. 13-6). In another description, a considerate leader "regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers" (Yukl, 1981, p. 107). Other attributes related to behaviors involving leader consideration include: supportiveness,

friendliness, expressive of appreciation for good work, taking time to listen, strengthening the self-esteem of workers through equality of treatment, and considering workers' suggestions (Bass, 1981; Yukl, 1981; Halpin and Winer, 1957).

Another dimension of leader behavior, initiating structure, represents "the extent to which the leader is likely to define his role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment" (Csoka, 1984, p. 13-6). A leader showing initiating structure "clearly defines [his or her] own role, and lets followers know what is expected" (Yukl, 1981, p. 107). Further descriptions of leader behavior which show initiating structure might be: directing workers, coordinating tasks, problem solving, insisting on upholding standards, criticizing poor work, and pressuring workers to meet deadlines (Bass, 1981; Yukl, 1981; Halpin and Winer, 1957).

Through leader behavior reflecting consideration and initiating structure, leaders in the military can influence the motivation and behavior of their soldiers (Yukl, 1981). Leaders can offer consideration as an inducement or social reward for soldier contributions. Conversely, leaders might rely upon behavior reflecting initiating structure to encourage soldier contributions. The value derived from understanding these aspects will be realized when soldiers and spouses describe their leaders' behavior explicitly or

implicitly in terms of consideration and initiating structure.

The five bases of power and leader consideration and initiating structure have been presented to provide a more accurate understanding of soldier and spouse perceptions of the impact of leader power and behavior on their family well-being. The next chapter presents a review of relevant research in two substantive areas that are integral parts of the subject matter analyzed in this thesis. These areas are the sociology of work and family, and the special case of military families. The research reviewed accounts for only a portion of the literature available in these areas. The review of relevant work and family research explains how work experiences in general can affect individual and family well-being. The review of relevant military family research describes the work demands of the Army, the ways the demands affect families, and how families adapt to the demands.

Chapter III- Work and Family Research

Work and Family Well-being

Worker well-being is based in part upon the social environment or climate at work. Social climate includes characteristics of the organization, leader style, and job variables that influence the nature and frequency of worker social contact. The leader and co-worker social support received by workers also influences their perceptions of the quality of their social climate (Repetti, 1987a).

In addition, "the way an employee actively interprets and experiences" (Repetti, 1987a, p. 717) the social climate plays a large role in his or her overall satisfaction and happiness. Consequently, workers' perceptions of the social climate may significantly contribute to their psychological well-being. Furthermore, positive social relations at work are linked with higher self-esteem and reduced symptoms of depression and anxiety among workers (Repetti, 1987a).

The social support offered by leaders impacts beneficially upon worker well-being when the social climate is aversive or negative, while leader social support has little impact in a positive social climate. However, when leaders are unsupportive amid an aversive social climate, they may contribute to the deleterious effects of the negative social climate upon workers. Co-workers, on the other hand, were shown to have significantly less impact upon

workers' psychological well-being than leaders (Repetti, 1987a).

This research has relevance and applicability to the social climate in a military unit. Soldier satisfaction with the quality of work life is contingent upon his or her perceptions of the unit, leader power and behavior, and social support. When soldiers are confronted with social adversities on the job, leader social support and social rewards can enhance soldier well-being. Conversely, when the social climate is negative and, in addition, leaders are unsupportive or offer few social rewards, then leaders contribute little or possibly detract from soldier well-being.

Besides worker well-being, family well-being is affected by the quality of work life through the impact of the work upon the employed family member or members. There are a number of effects of work upon the family. Excessive hours at work are a major source of interference with family life, while difficulty scheduling certain kinds of family activities around work schedules is a common problem experienced by families. Increased work hours are also the cause of a loss of intimacy, companionship, and recreational time in the family (Repetti, 1987a).

Furthermore, "experiences at work affect an employed husband's psychological state, particularly his emotional and interpersonal availability vis-a-vis family members. In

this way, a father's experiences at work 'spill over' into the socioemotional life of his family" (Repetti, 1987a, p. 103). The experiences of the husband described here also apply to the wife if she is employed outside the home.

A series of interviews conducted during a study by Repetti in 1982 produced revealing comments from women about the transfer of work stress or satisfaction into their family life. The respondents frequently began by indicating that their daily work experiences have a physical, emotional, and psychological impact on them (Repetti, 1987b). Their routines at work often make them feel more tired, irritable, and impatient at the end of the day, which stayed with them when they arrived home and later were expressed at home. Respondents stated that, in particular, they displaced their angry emotional reactions from experiences at work into relationships at home. In addition, they mentioned feelings of physical and emotional enervation following a day on the job, which hindered their capacity to be sensitive to family members' needs and feelings, or to manage problems at home (Repetti, 1987b).

The processes described here hold true in the military context as well. The carryover of military work-related experiences, to include the emotional, physical, and psychological stress of military demands, into off-duty family life may create much of the same responses as mentioned above within family relationships. Long duty hours and

weekend work by soldiers can interfere with family life and cause problems in the scheduling of family activities around work schedules. After a long day or week at work, soldier fatigue may spill over into relationships within the family, diminishing somewhat the soldier's ability to meet the emotional needs of family members. Furthermore, the irritability or angry emotional reactions engendered from soldiers' experiences at work are liable to be carried home with them and expressed in relationships there.

Since among the "the major contributors to satisfaction with family life are the individual's relationship with his children and his spouse" (Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers, 1976, p. 344), the importance of the impact of work on family relationships cannot be overstated. The work experiences within a military context have particularly salient effects on family life and well-being. As will be shown, the military has a unique combination of occupational demands that have extensive effects upon the families of soldiers and often require significant adaptation by the families.

Military Families

Leader-influenced Occupational Demands

There are significant occupational demands which are placed upon soldiers serving in the Army. These demands are common to most soldiers and presumably are caused by the requirement for mission accomplishment. They include the

risk of injury or death, the need to work long hours or on weekends, and separation from one's duty station for training or deployments. The effects of these demands on married enlisted soldiers are exacerbated by virtue of the additional strain they place upon family life.

The degree to which soldiers and their families adjust to military demands affects family quality of life and satisfaction. Both the soldier and the Army have a stake in the successful adaptation of military families to these demands. Given this context, this section will describe the leader-influenced demands upon soldiers and analyze the effects of these demands upon the quality of military family life and family satisfaction. Moreover, attention will be focused upon the adjustment and adaptation of families to these demands.

As a work organization, the Army places emphasis upon job or occupational aspects. Occupations are defined in terms of roles that either directly or indirectly produce social and financial consequences which serve as a major focus in one's life (Ritzer and Walczak, 1986). The Army is composed of numerous occupational specialties in which soldiers are trained and later serve at their unit of assignment. Some specialties require more of a soldier's time and energy than others. However, nearly all of the specialties are affected by the common occupational demands of the Army. The common occupational demands vary in

intensity and scope depending upon the post or unit of assignment. Besides the common demands, other demands include geographic mobility, normative constraints such as regulations or appearance standards, and pay constraints.

Army demands frequently are generated from within the leadership hierarchy. Leaders of units at all levels can generate demands in response to higher orders or to standards prescribed by their own organization. The units from smallest to largest at an Army post most frequently refer to: squad, platoon, company, battalion, brigade or division. A squad has approximately 8 members; platoon, 35; company, 150; battalion, 800; brigade, 3000; and division, 16,000. Leader power and behavior plays a salient role in influencing the extent and nature of the demands made upon soldiers and units.

The first and perhaps most serious occupational demand which the Army makes upon soldiers is the requirement for participation in potentially dangerous wartime combat deployments or military training where there is risk of injury or death, such as in weapons firing, armored vehicle maneuvers, and parachuting. In each case, soldiers are subject to being wounded or killed in the course of their duties. Leaders play a prominent role in controlling the degree of risk. Their emphasis on safety while in training influences the risk incurred by soldiers.

Another occupational demand on soldiers is the require-

ment to work long duty hours or on weekends to accomplish assigned missions. Of all demands, this is the one which leaders usually have the greatest control over, particularly battalion and company commanders. However, it is one of the most common demands made on soldiers, particularly noncommissioned officers and officers. According to one study, "the majority of men report that they work more than fifty hours in a typical week. Almost all report working more than forty hours" (Segal, 1986a, p. 194). Extra hours and weekend work is especially common when units are preparing for or returning from training deployments, which makes transitions before and after separations more demanding for soldiers and family members. Furthermore, long hours and weekend work often may not be compensated for, with the exception that time off is frequently given after overnight guard details.

A third occupational demand that soldiers must face is separations or absences from their families. The effects of this demand are likely to be felt directly by spouses and children. Separations, however, are also likely to be compensated for by leaders who can grant their soldiers "compensatory time," but which rarely spans the same duration as the separation. Separations may be required for several reasons including: short-term deployments for field training, alert readiness exercises, temporary duty at another post, short-term school assignments, and long-term

deployments such as the six-month long Sinai peacekeeping mission or unaccompanied tours (Defense Manpower Data Center, 1986b).

The figures representing the frequency of soldier separations are a testimony to the prevalence of this demand. A 1985 Department of Defense survey showed that 72% of enlisted personnel who had a spouse and/or dependents had been separated from their families for some time during the preceding year, while 30% of them had spent more than five months away from their families (Defense Manpower Data Center, 1986b). What potentially can be even more stressful on families is the cumulative effect of the demands of short-term separations when combined with long hours, weekend work, occupational risks, and long-term separations.

A last demand to be discussed that impacts upon soldiers is the condition of their living and working facilities and environments. The ability of soldiers to accomplish assigned missions depends on whether they have proper and sufficient tools, equipment, and facilities. Moreover, these factors affect soldier morale, safety, and productivity. When the conditions of facilities and environments deteriorate, demands upon soldiers can potentially increase, given a constant workload. Here again, leaders play a pivotal role in influencing the maintenance of facilities, housing, and equipment, and in so doing

contribute to soldier well-being.

Effects of Demands and Adaptation by Families

Adaptation to demands and satisfaction with military life are important to soldiers, their families, and also the Army. Soldiers and their families seek to adapt, or accomodate, to the demands in order to enhance their quality of life while in the service. Additionally, soldiers have an interest in the success of their military careers, which is fostered by adaptation. On the other hand, the Army has a stake in "assuring adequate support to families to promote wellness; develop a sense of community; and strengthen the mutually reinforcing bonds" (Wickham, 1983) between itself and military families. Ultimately, family satisfaction impacts upon morale, retention, and readiness of military personnel (Segal, 1986b).

With regard to the risk of injury or death to soldiers, very seldom have studies been performed to assess the effects of this on military families in peacetime. However, the risk of casualties during wartime has been documented as a source of stress on families (Segal, 1986b). The disruptive effects that a soldier's long duty hours and weekend work have upon his or her family presumably are not as intense in the short term as they become over time.

Notwithstanding the overt consequences which continual extra duty hours have upon the soldier's energy level and morale, the effect of nonpresence for family affairs can be

taxing as well. Soldiers who routinely spent extra time with military job demands ostensibly have less time to attend to the emotional needs of family members and perform family chores. In addition, for families with spouses employed outside the home, the additive effect of a soldier's long hours or weekend work on family welfare or child care is likely to be more stress-producing or dysfunctional.

Still other impacts of occupational time demands faced by soldiers include constraints on leave periods and limits on participation in outside pursuits, in particular further education. These constraints directly or indirectly affect families and require adjustment of leaves around scheduled training periods and adaptation of activities to suit busy military schedules.

Compared to other occupational demands, separations of soldiers from their families most evidently and directly affect relationships and routines within the family. Moreover, successful adaptation to separations requires significant adjustment by soldiers, their spouses, and children. One study states that the family's adjustment is dependent upon the wife's perception of the separation, the family resources to handle the separation, and the hardships produced by the separation (McCubbin, Dahl, and Hunter, 1976). Of marked importance is the degree of independence of the military wife and her willingness to endure separa-

tions by performing the roles of the absent soldier. The effect of both short- and long-term separations on families and the ways families adapt are described as follows.

Wives with children must assume the role of sole parent during their husband's separation. At times like this, spouses actually assume both parent roles, which fosters a more general pattern in many military households of matriarchal family structures (Stanton, 1976). Besides stress, the most frequent separation-induced problems reported by spouses include "loneliness, problems with children, physical illness, and loss of their usual social role in the community" (Segal, 1986b, p. 20). Moreover, spouses will sometimes express resentment or feelings of abandonment with regard to the separation from their husbands. Unquestionably, coping and adjustment to separation is a stressful experience for many spouses.

There are other related effects of separation on military families. It is likely that newly married couples may feel the effect of separations upon marital solidarity. Additionally, separations may require husbands to be away during major family events such as a wife's pregnancy, childbirth, children's birthdays, children's athletic events, or school graduations. Perhaps more critically, separations can interfere with parent-child relationships, which can affect a child's psychological development (Nice, 1978). Furthermore, as a result of separation, "suspicious

of infidelity are often activated or reinforced" (Little, 1971, p. 265) in soldiers or their spouses, which places greater strain on marital relations.

Based on all the above effects, soldiers and their families are required to adapt to separations through sharing of burdens and acceptance of numerous hardships. The costs involved vary according to each family situation. However, there are also benefits to be reaped from separations, such as the opportunity for both the soldier and spouse's individual growth while the soldier is away, and the chance for the marital relationship to develop through appreciation for each other's roles (Segal, 1986b).

Long-term deployment separation, ranging from two months to a year, complicates and aggravates the effects of demands upon soldiers and military families, and makes adaptation correspondingly more difficult. One particular investigation gathered data prior to a six month long deployment, then at two month long intervals during separation, and finally at two months after return (Van Vranken et al., 1984). The results of the collection effort yielded compelling evidence of increased stress in parent-child relationships and in spouses from having to make decisions alone, maintain automobiles, and manage finances. Loneliness was widely reported among spouses. There was also an increase in frequency of visits by spouses and children to health care providers.

Additionally, there was a reported increase among spouses in symptoms related to stress to include headaches, weight change, sleep disturbances, and changes or cessation in menstruation. During the reunion, a large number of spouses reported stress related difficulties similar to those experienced during separation. Despite these reports, however, the majority of families reported that they were able to readjust within two months after the soldier's return (Van Vranken et al., 1984).

By way of summary, this section has described several occupational demands of the Army upon married junior noncommissioned officers and their families. Additionally, it analyzed the effects of these demands upon military family life and satisfaction, and also how families adjust and adapt to the demands. Family satisfaction hinges upon family members' expectations and attitudes toward the Army, their own lifestyles, and about the soldier remaining in the Army. Satisfaction of military families with the Army lifestyle is hypothesized to foster better morale, retention, and readiness of soldiers (Segal, 1986c).

Chapter IV - Method

The Interview

The interview responses analyzed in this thesis were collected in June 1987 during the conduct of a larger study sponsored by the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (WRAIR). This study was designed to assess how soldiers and spouses feel about the quality of life in their community (Segal, 1987a). Additionally, it followed up on previous research conducted between 1980 and 1982 in the same housing area, and was performed partly to assess changes in the housing area since that time (Segal, 1986a).

The WRAIR interview contained questions relating to life at the post, satisfaction with a job in the Army, perceptions about the Army's impact on the family, social support networks, knowledge and use of post services, quality of life, and relationships with one's spouse and children (Segal, 1987b). Though specific questions were included in the interview to assess soldier and spouse perceptions of their leaders' power and behavior and its impact on their family well-being, responses to this set of questions were considered in the analysis along with the responses to other portions of the interview. Responses collected during the whole interview were eligible for incorporation into the analysis portion of this thesis because they lend qualitative support to responses concerning leader power and behavior.

A team of three trained interviewers performed the interviews. Besides the author, the interview team consisted of Dr. Mady W. Segal, a research sociologist and expert on military families from WRAIR, and an enlisted behavioral science specialist from WRAIR. The interview consisted of both closed- and open-ended questions, and lasted approximately 1 1/2 to 2 1/2 hours. In addition, the interview sessions were recorded on cassette tapes, and comments or observations made during the sessions by the interviewer were recorded on the interview forms as deemed necessary. Confidentiality of responses was maintained.

Respondents for the current study were selected at random from a junior noncommissioned officer housing area at the designated post. Approximately one family from 18 of the 20 courts that constitute the housing area was selected. Selected soldiers and spouses were contacted by letter prior to the interview informing them that families in their housing area would be studied. Moreover, the letter stated that the interviewers would be in their community during a particular period and would come to their door to ascertain whether they would be willing to be interviewed.

Both soldiers and spouses were interviewed in the majority of cases, but interviews were conducted separately and often in different rooms of their quarters. The number of respondents interviewed was 23 individuals, which included 8 couples. The ranks of the noncommissioned

officers were corporal or specialist, sergeant, and staff sergeant (pay grades E4 - E6). A sergeant first class (E7) and his wife were also interviewed. The ages of soldiers and spouses varied considerably, though most fell in their late 20s.

The following interview questions were used:

"I would like to ask you about your (husband's) leaders in your (his) unit and how they affect your family life.

What are the things that your leaders do that affect your family life?

Can you think of things that have happened recently? Please tell me about them.

Which leaders are you thinking about?

What do they do that affects your family life?

What do they do that has good effects on your family life?

Do they ever give you time off for family activities?

What do your leaders do that has negative effects on your family life?

How do your leaders influence your family's satisfaction?"

Interviewers were instructed to probe for leader behavior that impacts directly on the soldier and indirectly on the family, as well as leader behavior that directly influences the family.

Qualitative Analysis Plan

The approach to analyzing the responses is qualitative in nature. A qualitative analysis approach was chosen primarily for three reasons. First, soldier and spouse perceptions were sought during the interviews, and these perceptions include descriptions as well as affect, which lend themselves to qualitative analysis. For this reason also, open-ended questions were constructed and utilized for the interviews. Second, the number of respondents selected was relatively small, while the depth of the areas covered in the interview questions was quite extensive, which a qualitative analysis was better suited to handle. Third, a significant portion of the relevant research in the sociology of work and family and military families, upon which this thesis builds, is qualitative in nature. The thesis will utilize this research to establish a context and a basis for further qualitative and quantitative work in the analysis of soldier and spouse perceptions of leader power and behavior and military family well-being.

The analysis involves a process that begins with listening to the entire cassette tape from each interview, and where necessary supplementing this by extracting responses written by the interviewers on the interview forms. The objective of both of these tasks is to extract pertinent information and to describe accurately soldier and spouse perceptions of their leaders' power and behavior and

their family well-being.

Reliability is a factor which has been considered in the development of the qualitative analysis plan to explain soldier and spouse perceptions using Blau's theory. Reliability in accounting for soldier and spouse perceptions would ideally be demonstrated by repeated analysis of the interview tapes by different researchers, which would yield similar accounts of the perceptions (Rossi and Freeman, 1985). For this study, an ideal approach to insuring reliability could involve two or more researchers independently producing their own accounts of respondent perceptions utilizing Blau's theory. The researchers would then collaborate on their accounts where agreement exists, and work toward an agreement, if possible, where differences exist.

However, the use of this method of insuring reliability was not feasible for the analysis of all tapes in this study due to a lack of available personnel who had the time to perform such a task. Therefore, a somewhat scaled down and modified version of this method was employed for this thesis. After the author had analyzed several tapes, a second researcher, Mady W. Segal, listened to them with the author and discussed her analysis of the interviews using Blau's theory. She also added some analyses on other interviews using interview vignettes and knowledge gained from having conducted interviews.

Analysis of perceptions of leader power and behavior and its impact on family well-being will draw upon the respondents' own words to preserve the meaning and emotion behind the perceptions. The use of vignettes of interview responses will help to convey perceptions clearly and emphatically, and enable others to see the basis for the analysis and conclusions. Moreover, no attempt will be made to establish further accuracy of the perceptions, or to account for the perceptions of leaders. Given the descriptions and vignettes from soldiers and spouses, Blau's structural exchange theory will be utilized to account for their perceptions. Blau's theory will be used to explain the dynamics relating leader power and behavior to military family well-being. The explanation will involve describing the exchange relationships between leaders and soldiers, leaders and spouses, and soldiers and spouses as Blau would account for them.

A deductive method will be used to apply Blau's theory to this study. What this means is that Blau's general concepts will be applied to the particular situation and accounts of perceptions will be made in specific terms. The leader's power and behavior, as perceived by soldiers and spouses, will be described specifically. Also, soldier and spouse behavior will be described in specific terms. Furthermore, what is exchanged by leaders in the exchange relationships with soldiers and spouses will be concretely

accounted for. In all cases, it is assumed that soldiers offer instrumental contributions, compliance, and efforts at work in exchange for leader inducements and social rewards. Accounts will include concise descriptions of the norms of exchange and values of rewards. Besides the description of the exchange relationships with leaders, account will be given as to what specifically is exchanged between soldiers and spouses, and how leader power and behavior impacts on family well-being through the leader's exchange with either the soldier or spouse.

The analysis will be presented such that sections will be apportioned to addressing designated component questions, each of which deals with a different aspect of Blau's theory. The presentation is organized this way in order to account separately for different facets of the exchange relationships. Wherever appropriate, theoretical explanations will be supported with theory or relevant research in leadership, and the sociology of work and family, including military families. Finally, the discussion presented in the last chapter will comprise a synopsis of the main points learned from the social exchange relationships, as well as an organizing typology of soldier and spouse perceptions of the impact of leader power and behavior on their family well-being.

Chapter V - Analysis of Interview Responses

Exchange Principles

The following vignettes are drawn upon in order to use Blau's implicit exchange principles to account for and provide an understanding of soldier and spouse perceptions of the impact of their leaders' power and behavior on their family well-being:

Vignette 1. I was trying to get emergency leave so I could be off and take care of my little boy [who had the chicken pox] and they wouldn't give it to me. My first sergeant was going to give it to me but the civilian in charge ... [of where I work] said no, I couldn't have emergency leave (Female specialist four with a civilian husband; food service military occupation specialty (MOS)).

Here the soldier is expressing feelings of resentment toward her civilian leader because the leader had denied the soldier's request for emergency leave. The leader has the power to control the soldier's time. In the exchange relationship between the soldier and leader, the soldier exchanges contributions of work effort, time spent on the job, and compliance for the leader's reward of compassionate time off for the soldier. Assuming that the soldier had been fulfilling her responsibilities, the norms of exchange of reciprocity and fairness in this relationship had been

violated by the leader because the leader had not initially granted the time off to the soldier. The soldier had later spoken to the leader in person about her reasons for the leave request and was granted time off, which shows the results that direct communication and explanation of the request can produce.

The initial expectation of the soldier ostensibly was that time off should be given by the leader. The expectation seems to have been reinforced by the first sergeant. In this case, the leader's behavior fell short of the soldier's expectations, resulting in the soldier's expression of disapproval. This vignette serves as an example of a violation of Blau's reciprocity principle in the exchange relationship between leaders and soldiers, because of the lack of fairness in exchange. Also, assuming that the soldier had been performing well, the vignette demonstrates how the failure of reciprocity produces anger. Though the impact on the family was not stated explicitly by the soldier, the implication may have seemed obvious to the soldier that the leader's initial behavior would most likely have impacted adversely on family well-being because the soldier would not have had the time off necessary to attend to her ill child.

Vignette 2. [A bad thing commanders do] is not letting the junior NCOs get involved in some of the [social] activities [which

officers and senior NCOs get involved in].
[This is what we call] the high society
syndrome (Male staff sergeant with computers
MOS).

The soldier is expressing his disappointment over his leader's behavior and perhaps the inequality built into the relationship between himself and his leaders. He perceives the leader behavior as involving a failure to include junior noncommissioned officers in leader social activities, which may or may not have included families. Moreover, he apparently aspires to attain the status which will enable him, and possibly his family, to attend the activities. Though it is not clear, this soldier ostensibly expects and places value in his affiliation with other unit leaders and inclusion in their activities. The exchange relationship between leaders and soldiers is perceived to involve reciprocal and fair exchange of leader inclusion of soldiers in their social activities for the soldier's instrumental contributions at work. Thus, social inclusion is perceived to be a reward over which leaders have some control. The soldier's disapproval of the leader behavior is reflective of a perceived violation of the norms of exchange by the leaders, which constitutes a violation of Blau's reciprocity principle.

Furthermore, assuming that the soldier has earned the inclusion that he seeks, this vignette illustrates Blau's

imbalance principle, because the maintenance of stability in the exchange relationships between officers and senior NCOs has been traded off for strain in relations between junior NCOs and leaders. Finally, the impact of the leader's behavior on the soldier's family well-being is presumed to be negative because the soldier's disappointment would be communicated to other family members, who would likely share in the disappointment.

Vignette 3. Sending him [my husband] [away] to school [is what leaders do that impacts on my family well-being]. It's bad on the kids. My little boy ... his grades have [fallen]. I guess it's affected a lot of the kids (Wife of a sergeant; sergeant's MOS is personnel management).

Here, a spouse expresses her belief that her husband's nonpresence with the family because of attendance at an Army school is having a detrimental effect on her son's school grades. The spouse disapproved of the leaders' behavior which involved requiring or requesting that the soldier attend the school. Schooling was perceived by the spouse as disruptive to her family routine, rather than as beneficial to the soldier's career. In the exchange relationship between the leaders and the soldier, the norm of reciprocity and fairness requires that the leaders' request to send the soldier to school is matched by the soldier's compliance.

The spouse and children expect that the soldier will be able to meet the emotional needs of family members, though the soldier is certainly unable to do so while away at school. The failure of the soldier to meet the spouse's and children's needs, combined with the lack of reciprocity in the exchange of companionship and time between the soldier and family members, results in the spouse's expressed disapproval of the leaders' behavior.

The child's sense of loss of the father's companionship is interfering with his school performance, perhaps due to feelings of deprivation that are expressed in the child's reduced efforts in school. This vignette exemplifies a violation of Blau's subsequent exchange principle and reciprocity principle as it applies to the soldier and spouse, and soldier and child. The spouse perceives the leader's behavior as having a negative impact on family well-being as a result.

Vignette 4. His ... platoon sergeant's attitude ... they've had so much trouble ... I guess he [my husband] feels it personally and then comes home and he's not happy. I don't think he really takes it out on us but at the same time it's hard for him to put it aside and he gets concerned. I find that we talk about it every night, things that go on at work His platoon sergeant, he's not

there very often for one thing, and then, ... the platoon sergeants fight among themselves and compete among themselves, which affects the guys The sergeant that he's under right now, he's very, very competitive ... but not in a positive way ... he wants to make the office look better instead of worrying about whether the birds are getting up ... instead of worrying about the job itself (Wife of a sergeant; sergeant is a helicopter mechanic).

The spouse expresses disapproval of her husband's leader, whom she perceives as having a bad attitude, as being competitive, and as not placing work priorities where they belong. The soldier reportedly feels resentful of his platoon sergeant's bad attitude and he perceives that he is treated unfairly. He often comes home unhappy and unable to leave the feelings behind at work. The platoon sergeant's behavior, as described by the spouse, involves a competitive attitude with regard to proving his platoon is the best platoon and insuring his platoon looks the best. However, the platoon sergeant reportedly does not supervise his soldiers very much, and he generates competition between his platoon and other platoons.

In the exchange relationship between the platoon sergeant and the soldier, the platoon sergeant has apparent-

ly provided only limited consideration to the soldier. The soldier most likely expected his leaders to be less competitive and less concerned about the organization of the office area. The soldier responds with dissatisfaction to his platoon sergeant's ostensible violation of the norm of reciprocity in the exchange relationship between them, and to the minimal social rewards provided by the leader, which had not been consistent with the soldier's expectations.

This vignette illustrates a violation of Blau's subsequent exchange principle and reciprocity principle. The spouse apparently perceives that the leader's behavior is having a negative impact on her family's well-being, and she and her husband engage in frequent discussions about this leader. Her husband's periodic preoccupation with his leader's behavior strains his ability to effectively meet the emotional needs of family members.

Vignette 5. When we first got here I needed [an operation] He asked for taking leave time to stay with the children while I was in the hospital. They refused to give it to him. We had to find a babysitter. When I went in for surgery, they [his leaders] refused to let him have time off to be there (Wife of a sergeant; sergeant's MOS is finance).

The spouse expresses her disapproval of leader behavior that involved preventing her husband from taking leave time while she was in the hospital. Apparently, the soldier requested leave or time off for family reasons and the requests were denied by his leaders. The prior expectations of the soldier and spouse ostensibly were that unit leaders would permit ample and fair time off.

Here, their expectations failed to be met when leaders ostensibly denied leave privileges to the soldier. The lack of reciprocity in the exchange, combined with the failure to meet their expectations, resulted in their dissatisfaction with the leaders' behavior. The spouse's perception of imbalance in the exchange relationship reflects a violation of Blau's reciprocity principle. Also, within the exchange relationship between the soldier and spouse, the spouse was particularly vulnerable and in need of support at the time of the operation, which her husband was unable to provide for her. This also reflects a violation of reciprocity within their relationship. Besides having the added expense of a babysitter, the soldier and spouse perceived that the leaders' behavior had a negative impact on their family well-being because of the husband's inability to meet family needs during a period of family crisis when it was required most.

Vignette 6. Of course they [his leaders] can help. If he [my husband] has a problem with

housing, movers, finance, sure that all affects [my family well-being] ... and they can enforce or back him up if there is a problem and support him When he reenlisted ... they had him under all the wrong information and he wrote a letter himself ... and took it to the commander of the hospital who took it to the commander of the [next higher unit] and now everything is worked out They definitely can support us (Wife of a specialist four; specialist four works in a medical MOS).

The spouse here expresses her assurance that her husband's leaders would support the family in times of need, while citing an example of how they already have significantly helped with one problem. The leader's behavior involved meeting the expressed needs of the soldier and his family with regard to his reenlistment. The expectations of the spouse ostensibly are that leaders will support her husband and her family in times of need. Conversely, the leaders value and expect the soldier to continue his contributions on the job.

The exchange relationship described here involves leaders providing the social rewards of instrumental support and consideration to the soldier. The perceived norms of fairness and reciprocity in the exchange coupled with the

meeting or exceeding of the spouse's and soldier's expectations led to their approval and satisfaction with the leader's behavior.

This vignette can be used to illustrate Blau's reinforcement principle in that the soldier values what he receives from the leaders and therefore provides more of his services for the leaders to continue their support. Conversely, leaders also value soldier contributions and thus they provide their inducements to encourage soldier contributions. The spouse's perception that family well-being is positively helped by unit leaders is based on the direct impact which housing, moving, finance and the reenlistment of the soldier have upon the family.

Vignette 7. My wife and the lieutenant, they are pretty close. In fact [when I was in the hospital] ... my lieutenant came in and kept my kids and he's done things for my wife. They're on real good terms ... they joke around ... they're pretty good friends (Male sergeant first class serving in an armor MOS).

The soldier approves of leader behavior that shows consideration, friendship, and social support for his spouse. The leader's behavior involves actually looking out for the spouse and children during a particularly stressful time when the soldier was unable to do so. Here, the

soldier apparently values and expects a reasonable degree of consideration from his leaders.

In the exchange relationship between the leader and spouse, the soldier's leader provided the rewards of both consideration and assistance to the spouse when the soldier was in the hospital. The leader's behavior is reflective of a way to confer social status to the family of the soldier. The soldier perceived that the norms of reciprocity and fairness existed in the exchange relationship and apparently his expectations were met or exceeded by his leader's consideration.

The exchange between the leader and the spouse described here illustrates both Blau's reciprocity principle and subsequent exchange principle. Additionally, the soldier perceived that the leader's caring and helping with the children had a direct, positive impact on family well-being.

Vignette B. [The way leaders influence my family well-being is that] if something happens or goes on [with my husband's schedule at work] somebody's on the phone calling you and letting you know about it (Wife of a sergeant first class; sergeant first class serves in an armor MOS).

The spouse expresses her approval of leader power and behavior that reflects consideration for her family. The

leader behavior involves calling, or having another soldier call, the wives about soldiers who will not be home on time, or about other important unit occurrences involving their husbands. The spouse's apparent prior expectations are that leaders will show her respect and support by conveying information about her husband's late hours whenever possible.

In the social exchange relationship described here, the leader provided the social rewards of consideration and predictability to the spouse. The spouse's satisfaction with the leader's behavior was based on the fulfillment of her expectations for leader consideration in the form of caring enough to convey the information, and her perception that exchange obligations were fulfilled in the leader-soldier relationship. Thereupon, this vignette serves as an illustration of Blau's subsequent exchange principle. It is believed that the leader's consideration had a positive effect on family well-being since information about the soldier's schedule reduced the spouse's concern and increased the predictability of the family schedule.

Rewards and Compliance

The following vignettes serve as examples of how Blau's conceptualization of the exchange of rewards for compliance with leader demands can provide an understanding of soldier and spouse perceptions of the impact of their leaders' power and behavior on their family well-being:

Vignette 1. [The people I work for] are inconsiderate of the fact that you have a family I got called at 11 o'clock [in the morning] on a Saturday for a function to do that day. The chief of ... [my section] and OIC [officer in charge] did this I think they could be more considerate sometimes [The chief of my section] only cares about herself (Female specialist four with a civilian husband; food service MOS).

The soldier here is expressing disapproval of her leaders' behavior. The leaders' behavior involved informing the soldier late about a requirement to work on a weekend, which a leader has the power to do. The soldier views her leaders as inconsiderate because the leader demands were perceived to be unfair, or illegitimate. The soldier's concern centered around the requirement to work on a weekend, while late notification seemed to be also a reason for her disapproval. The legitimacy of the leader demands as perceived by the soldier might have been greater had the leader communicated information regarding the rationale for the demand, and in the process, reflected more consideration.

The soldier values and expects to be treated with reasonable consideration by her leaders. In the social exchange relationship described here, the leaders failed to

exchange the social reward of consideration for the soldier's instrumental work compliance. Furthermore, the soldier perceived that the leaders failed to represent adequately the soldier's best interests.

In the soldier's perception, an imbalance was created in the exchange, leading to a violation of the norm of reciprocity in exchange, and concomitantly, the soldier's expressed disapproval. This situation is reflective of Blau's concept of violations in the exchange of rewards for compliance. The impact of the soldier's weekend duty requirements on family well-being would involve the soldier's nonpresence for family activities and a temporal inability to contribute to family emotional needs or share in household tasks or childrearing responsibilities.

Vignette 2. [The leaders] put her [my wife] in for rank. They respect her because she is doing a good job....She was ... [a private, and she will be a noncommissioned officer soon]. So that's pretty fast for the time she's been back in [service] (Civilian husband of a specialist four; soldier's MOS is food service).

The husband approves and is proud of his wife's timely military advancement, which he perceives to be commensurate with her efforts and performance. He believes that the unit leaders' promotion of his wife was appropriate and rewarding

behavior, from which he feels the reflected glory. In the exchange relationship between the soldier and the leaders, the leaders provided the social reward of promotions to the soldier.

The soldier valued advancement as a means of achieving increased status and pay. Moreover, the soldier expected to be promoted in exchange for her efforts. The reciprocity and fairness in the exchange of the promotions for the soldier's contributions was apparently met with approval and satisfaction by the soldier and spouse. The reciprocal exchange of rewards for compliance here, and the resultant satisfaction and tangible benefits of the promotion in terms of pay and status for both the soldier and spouse, illustrate the positive impact which leader behavior is perceived to have on family well-being.

Vignette 3. This is really the best duty he's had since he's been in the Army, because he gets to take time off like when the kids have something going on at school, like their field day Haven't had any problem with him being able to be there Tomorrow we're having a picnic that he's gonna get to go to. It's my daughter's class [picnic] They [his leaders] gave him plenty of time to take care of the stuff like my ID

card ... (Wife of a sergeant; sergeant works in a medical MOS).

The spouse approves of leader behavior which shows consideration for her husband's time and her family's welfare. The leader behavior includes granting the soldier time off to attend meaningful family events or to take care of essential family related errands. In the exchange relationship between the leader and soldier, the leader provided the social rewards of consideration and time off to the soldier.

The soldier and spouse expect leaders to provide consideration in exchange for the soldier's work efforts. As the wife perceives things, there is fair and reciprocal exchange of leader social rewards for the soldier's compliance. The spouse's perception of fairness in the exchange of rewards for compliance, coupled with the meeting or exceeding of her expectations for sufficient time off for the soldier, contributes to her satisfaction with leader power and behavior. This vignette thus demonstrates Blau's conceptualization of the exchange of rewards for compliance. As a result of the soldier having time to spend on important family needs, he is able to exchange companionship and esteem with family members plus provide for their emotional needs or assist with family errands, which positively contributes to family well-being.

Vignette 4. The first sergeant ... believe in trying to have families to stick together The wives got together with his wife ... they was gonna give this Halloween party for all the kids to come [The first sergeant told the soldiers] you're going to bring your family. We went and took the kids ... it was a lot of fun ... the kids, they loved it It was real nice (Wife of a staff sergeant; staff sergeant is an infantryman).

Here, the spouse conveys how much her family enjoyed a unit-sponsored Halloween party for the children of the soldiers. The spouse approves of leader behavior which enhances the happiness of her family. The leaders' behavior involved the planning, organizing, and running of a Halloween party for children of the soldiers' families.

The soldier and spouse apparently expected their leaders to treat them and their families with respect, esteem, and consideration. In the leader-soldier exchange relationship, leaders provided the social reward of esteem and a fun time for soldiers' families through a party. The first sergeant's requirement that the soldiers bring their families may have been resented by some soldiers, but this was offset ostensibly by the enjoyment which the party produced for the families. This vignette illustrates not

only how spouse expectations for leader behavior were met or exceeded, but how the provision of rewards by leaders led to perceptions that leader behavior positively impacts on family well-being.

Vignette 5. His EER [enlisted evaluation report] [is a way leaders can positively effect our family well-being]. That gives him more encouragement, and it makes his attitude more positive, more satisfied with his job, which in turn makes our life more pleasant because he's satisfied and he knows that he's improving, excelling. And of course if he's happy, then ... [we will] be too] (Wife of a specialist four; specialist four works in a medical MOS).

The spouse perceives that the soldier's evaluation reports, which are written by his leaders, positively affect family well-being. The leader behavior, as described by the spouse, involves writing the evaluation report on her husband. The spouse approves of the behavior of leaders that is encouraging and supportive of her husband through the use of the evaluation report. Moreover, the spouse is apparently satisfied with her husband's past report(s).

The soldier and spouse value the support and esteem they receive from unit leaders through evaluations. In the leader-soldier social exchange relationship, leaders

have provided the social reward of esteem to the soldier. The value that an encouraging and rewarding evaluation report had to the soldier and spouse led to their satisfaction with the leaders' behavior.

This vignette provides an example of Blau's conceptualization of the exchange of rewards for compliance. Furthermore, the spouse's perception of family well-being is attributable to the affective exchange between the soldier and other family members. The soldier's satisfaction with his leaders' behavior is communicated to the family members, and he is probably more pleasant to be with. In turn, other members of the family sense and share the well-being experienced by the soldier.

Power and Sanctions

The following vignettes exemplify how Blau's description of leader power and sanctions can explain and enable an understanding of soldier and spouse perceptions of the impact of leader power and behavior on military family well-being:

Vignette 1. [When I was in the military]
... they wait 'til the last minute. You do nothing all day ... and [they say] you can't go home 'til you get this done (Civilian husband, who was prior enlisted, of a specialist four).

The husband of a soldier recounts, with disapproval, the behavior of his former leaders, which he perceives as illegitimate because their demands came at the last minute and required him to work late when there was time to accomplish the tasks earlier in the day. The leaders may have kept soldiers in the unit late because tasks needed to be completed. However, the soldier is dissatisfied because of the questionable legitimacy of the hour of the day which the demands were made, and the fact that there was nothing to do earlier in the day.

An exchange relationship of this type involves leaders providing predictable and fair working hours to soldiers. Here, the soldier expects leaders to provide reasonably predictable working hours. The norm of fairness in the exchange of predictability for soldier contributions is violated by the leaders, resulting in soldier dissatisfaction.

The leaders' use of legitimate power and coercive power, and the extant power differential between leaders and soldiers, enables leaders to make demands or impose sanctions upon soldiers. The demand to work late, combined with the perception of it being unnecessary, presumably would have a negative impact upon the soldier's family well-being because of the soldier's nonpresence for family activities, his increased level of fatigue, and his communication of

dissatisfaction with his leader's sanctions to others in the family.

Vignette 2. Indirectly [leaders influence my family's satisfaction]. Field duty causes excessive separation, or the leader calls you [one of the] key personnel or invaluable to be able to accomplish his mission and keeps you there longer than any other person would The only time ... [long hours would] happen is when the commanders forget to do something and there's an inspection coming up and they get caught on the short end of the stick, so they have to make up for their mistake of not being foresighted Prior planning makes good sense I think a lot of it is mediocre to send somebody back on a weekend saying that this has to be done and it's not going to affect the readiness of the unit that it couldn't wait until Monday morning (Male staff sergeant with computers MOS).

Here, the soldier expresses general disapproval of leader behavior that in his judgment involves poor planning, retaining soldiers at work after duty hours or on weekends, or scheduling excessive deployments which separate soldiers from their families. What is exchanged by leaders in these situations is the social reward of predictability of the

work schedule, and bestowing labels of "key" or "invaluable" upon soldiers. Soldiers expect reciprocity and fairness in the exchange with their leaders as well as legitimate and fair demands from their leaders. However, because of the differential in power between leaders and the soldier, the soldier will comply even if the work schedule is not predictable.

This soldier has pointed to leader demands on soldier time that are perceived to be unfair or excessive, and a violation of reciprocity in the exchange. Moreover, the soldier perceives that the label "key personnel" is a reward that is irrelevant and obliging of longer hours. These perceptions result in soldier disapproval of leader behavior and potentially the soldier's decreased job satisfaction. What this soldier points to are violations of Blau's reciprocity principle. It is anticipated that the soldier will perceive that work after normal duty hours or on weekends is fair when leader behavior involves reasonable efforts at planning and considering whether or not the demand can wait until Monday.

In addition, these situations are indicative of leader use of legitimate power, reward power, and coercive power to make and control demands on soldiers or impose sanctions upon them. Though it was not stated, a soldier's long duty hours and weekend work, or excessive separations would presumably have a negative impact on family well-being due

to the soldier's inability to provide rewards to family members, i.e., to meet family member emotional needs, be a companion, or share in household chores, while away from the family. This is especially salient in light of established family patterns which may have to be changed because of the soldier's schedule.

Vignette 3. I know many a day that he would go into work and he had a female sergeant that was over him and [she] was very much onto him about the way he did his job She would get really irate with him and he would come home in a very bad mood because of it. They [his unit] expect the husband to jump at the least command and so what with the wife. Family is nothing to them (Wife of a sergeant; sergeant's MOS is finance).

The spouse perceives that the leader's harsh behavior has caused the soldier's dissatisfaction and moodiness, which in turn has affected family well-being. The leader's use of coercive power is perceived by the soldier and spouse as not showing respect for soldier or family welfare. The soldier apparently values and expects the social rewards of approval and respect from his leaders.

In the social exchange relationship between the leader and soldier, the leader has exchanged only limited consideration and apparently some disrespect with the soldier. The

spouse perceives therefore, that the norms of reciprocity and fairness were violated by the leader in the exchange relationship. On account of this, and the failure of the leader to meet the soldier and spouse's expectations, the spouse disapproves of the leader's behavior.

The use of legitimate and coercive power by the leader enables the leader to make and control demands on soldiers or punish soldiers. Thus, this vignette demonstrates Blau's concept of power and sanctions. The bad mood and dissatisfaction of the soldier, and the ostensible lack of concern for the family that leaders show would most likely negatively impact upon family well-being.

Vignette 4. [My husband would] ... come home in a real bad mood. He usually won't be mad at me or anything but if the kids keep bothering him ... he'd be mad at them or yell at them, tell them to leave him alone or something. I guess his whole attitude would be changed He's an assistant squad leader If something is messed up or somebody did something wrong it would reflect on his leadership ... and usually they [his leaders] blame him ... especially in the line of work (Wife of a sergeant; sergeant is a combat engineer).

The spouse perceives that the leaders' behavior has a negative impact on her husband's mood which, in turn, affects her family well-being. The leaders, as perceived by the spouse, find fault with the soldier's leadership when things go wrong. Apparently, the husband takes the blame from his leaders for much of the things that go wrong in his squad. The soldier's consequent behavior involves occasional outbursts of temper at his children.

Given the power differential between leaders and the soldier, leaders exercise their power in ways such as imposing sanctions on those responsible for poor performance. Here, the spouse expects that her husband will receive consideration and fair treatment from his leaders. In the exchange relationship between unit leaders and the soldier, leaders apparently exchange only limited consideration with the soldier. The spouse's perception that an imbalance exists in the leader-soldier exchange, coupled with the failure of leader behavior to meet her expectations, has contributed to her dissatisfaction with the leader's behavior.

Leader use of legitimate power and coercive power is a means by which leaders can make and control demands upon soldiers, or punish soldiers. This vignette illustrates Blau's aspect of power and sanctions, by showing how leaders often exercise their power. The spouse perceives that leader power and behavior has adversely affected her

husband's satisfaction and her family well-being. Family well-being is affected by the lack of consideration and esteem the husband shows the children when he is upset over how he was treated by his leaders. In situations such as these, the soldier is punishing the family because of normative constraints against expressing anger toward leaders.

Norms of Exchange (Reciprocity and Fairness) and Violations of the Norms

The following vignettes demonstrate how Blau's conceptualization of the norms of reciprocity and fairness in exchange can account for and lead to an understanding of soldier and spouse perceptions of the impact of leader power and behavior on military family well-being:

Vignette 1. [The leader of my section did not allow me] to go to PLDC ... wouldn't let me go to leadership school. And it's not just me either, she treats the NCOIC like that too, won't let him go to school. The only reason why he went to school recently was ... [because of a higher headquarters ruling] (Female specialist four with a civilian husband; food service MOS).

The soldier expresses her dissatisfaction with her leader's behavior, which involved the leader not supporting her attendance at leadership school. This situation stands in contrast to the vignette cited earlier, wherein the

spouse disapproved of the leader's behavior for sending the soldier away to school. In an exchange relationship between the leader and soldier, the leader could provide the social reward of career enhancement through school attendance to the soldier. The soldier's prior expectations were ostensibly to have the opportunity to attend schooling, which is a prerequisite for promotions and sought after for this reason. Unlike the earlier vignette, this soldier was not concerned with the separation from family created by school attendance, but more with the career benefits schooling could produce.

As the soldier perceived things, the norms of fair and reciprocal exchange were violated because the leader withheld the social reward of sending the soldier to school, and the soldier's expectations failed to be met, resulting in feelings of resentment and disapproval of her leader's behavior. The imbalance in exchange represents a violation of Blau's reciprocity principle. It is assumed that the soldier's dissatisfaction impacted in a negative way on her family's satisfaction and well-being after she communicated her feelings to her spouse and children, and the family members became aware that the soldier's contributions at work did not yield an opportunity for her professional growth.

Vignette 2. [As far as his leaders] keeping him late ... we've not had any of that

It's a great unit. Everybody wants to go home [and gets off on time] (Wife of a sergeant; sergeant works in a medical MOS).

Here, the spouse perceives that her husband's working hours are fair because his leaders dismiss the unit on time at the end of the duty day. The leader behavior involves releasing the soldiers at close of business each day, thereby reflecting consideration for soldiers' time. In the leader-soldier social exchange relationship, leaders provided social rewards to soldiers to include predictability of scheduling and consideration.

The spouse values the time which the soldier spends with family. Moreover, the spouse's expectation is that the soldier will be released from duty on time at the end of the day for putting in a full day's work. The spouse's perception that there is reciprocity and fairness in this exchange relationship, plus the meeting of her expectations, results in her satisfaction with the unit leaders' behavior. Moreover, she implicitly compares her husband's situation to others' experiences and feels relatively well-off. It is presumed that leader consideration for the soldiers' hours and the predictability of the soldier's schedule had a positive impact on family well-being by enabling the soldier to take the necessary time, as he had planned, to spend with family.

Vignette 3. [The soldiers] are on a very strict schedule at how many hours they're supposed to work and that was violated quite a bit They go on crew rest, and that was violated He's worked twelve hours several days. He feels that he never has any time. He wants to come home and go to sleep [This] definitely [affects my family well-being]. Oftentimes he comes home, and I've been home all day and if nothing else want to just talk and he's very tired (Wife of a sergeant; sergeant is a helicopter mechanic).

The spouse describes the soldier's schedule as demanding to the point where the soldier is usually pushed by his leaders beyond the required working hours, which causes the soldier to feel quite tired and sometimes frustrated when he arrives home from work. The spouse knows that unit leaders have the power to retain soldiers at work. However, she is disappointed with the leader behavior because it negatively affects her husband's morale and energy level.

In exchange relations between leaders and soldiers, soldiers would expect their leaders to provide to them the social reward of predictable schedules and appropriate time off. The soldier legitimately expects to have the crew rest periods off. Leaders can require soldiers to work into

crew rest periods, but not usually without perceptions of unfairness by the soldiers. The soldier perceives that his leaders have violated the norm of fairness in the exchange by making unfair demands which keep unit soldiers working into crew rest periods. The imbalance in exchange results in soldier dissatisfaction and fatigue at the end of the day which hinders the energy and time the soldier is able to devote to his spouse and children. Thus, the soldier is not willing to talk with the wife as she desires, and he does not meet her needs for companionship through exchange of his time and empathy. The spouse perceives that the leader behavior negatively impacts on family well-being, due to her husband's dissatisfaction and fatigue.

Vignette 4. My house burned down [which was located near this post] At that particular time, our biggest problem was ... getting me stabilized I tried to get a compassionate [reassignment to remain at this post] ... and they [higher headquarters] said no. That was our biggest stumbling block I lost everything I was really furious and things had gotten so bad at one time I felt like just throwing it all away I went to personnel management here at [the post] People here were real understanding as far as helping me get my

paperwork together. I had letters from ... [leaders] ... then we all sent this to [Washington] D.C. and [the response was] just flat no. [As it turned out, I was reassigned to this post but not for compassionate reasons] (Male sergeant first class serving in an armor MOS).

The soldier expresses his dissatisfaction with the fact that higher headquarters could not secure the approval of his request for a compassionate reassignment after his house burned down and he lost all of his possessions. The leader behavior involved an effort to help the soldier get a compassionate reassignment, but a failure to do so ostensibly because of constraints on the leaders' ability to change the course of events. The soldier apparently expected and valued the intervention and support of his leaders to help him remain assigned to his post to resolve problems stemming from the house fire.

In the social exchange relationship described here, leaders provided the social rewards of support and instrumental assistance to the soldier. In the process, the soldier's expectations were fulfilled and the soldier perceived the reciprocity in the exchange relationship between the leaders and himself. However, despite the leaders' efforts to obtain the reassignment for the soldier, the soldier perceived that the nonapproval of the reassign-

ment by higher headquarters was unfair. This outcome caused the soldier's tremendous dissatisfaction with his situation. The cumulative effect of the stress of the house fire and the perception that higher headquarters was unable to guarantee a reassignment to the current post, had a negative impact upon the soldier's family well-being.

Vignette 5. [Something leaders do that impacts on my family well-being is] ... calling at 4 in the morning This happened a couple of times when they call him ... for ranges or something. They say he was supposed to have been there, and his chain of command didn't tell him that, and so he gets chewed out for being late to something he didn't know about (Wife of a sergeant; sergeant is a combat engineer).

Here, the spouse expresses her dissatisfaction with leader behavior, which she perceives as demonstrating a lack of respect and consideration for the soldier and the family, and as being harsh on the soldier. On some occasions, leader behavior involved calling the soldier at his home early in the morning, and requiring that the soldier be somewhere, or blaming the soldier for not being on time to a range. The soldier apparently had stated that he had not known about leader requests for him to be at particular ranges.

The soldier expects his leaders to keep him informed of training events and to provide him with as much predictability to his schedule as possible. The exchange relationship described by the spouse shows the leader providing not only limited consideration through early morning telephone calls, but through making requests which are not legitimate, and through blaming the soldier.

The spouse perceives that there are violations of the norm of fairness in the exchange relationship between the leaders and soldier. Moreover, not only does leader behavior fall short of her expectations, but she believes that the leader demands are not reasonable or considerate because of the time at which they were given, the lack of predictability afforded to the soldier's schedule, and the blaming of the soldier. The leader behavior is perceived by the spouse as having a negative effect upon the family's well-being because of disturbances created by the calls, the soldier's requirement to change his routine unexpectedly, and the loss of status to the soldier resulting from his being overtly reprimanded.

Values and Expectations

The vignettes below illustrate how Blau's view of followers' values and expectations can account for and provide an understanding of soldier and spouse perceptions of the impact of leader power and behavior on military family well-being:

Vignette 1. [There is] ... an E6 in charge. [He doesn't] ... act like no E6....[He] don't know what to do. [My wife is] ... supposed to look up to him. Sometimes she has to do his work. He's an E6 in the United States Army. He don't act like an E6. He acts like a private. The paperwork ... [my wife] do it. It's supposed to be the E6's job doing it. [My wife is] ... only ... [a specialist four] ... and she is teaching him how to do the paperwork. [This affects my family life with] stress, too much stress (Civilian husband of a specialist four; soldier's MOS is food service).

Here, the husband overtly displays his disapproval of the behavior of his wife's leader. The leader has displayed a lack of job competency, and an overreliance upon the soldier to fill in for him. What is normatively exchanged in the leader-soldier relationship is the leader's social reward of esteeming and supporting unit soldiers through demonstrating technical expertise in his job. The soldier's expectations are that her leader will be technically competent and will provide adequate rewards for her work efforts, and either not require her to do his job, or provide additional rewards for doing part of his job.

The norm of reciprocity and fairness in the exchange relationship was violated by the leader for requiring the soldier to do the leader's job, while the soldier provided her efforts and contributions at work. As a result, the behavior of the leader was perceived to be unfair, and the leader's demands were perceived to be illegitimate. Clearly the expectations and values held by the soldier were not met by the leader, resulting in the soldier's feelings of exploitation and dissatisfaction.

The spouse perceives that the impact of this situation on the soldier caused stress within the family, and correspondingly the spouse empathizes with the soldier. The stress may have reduced the ability of the soldier to exchange the usual companionship, affection, and esteem with the spouse and children. Correspondingly, an imbalance occurred in the affective exchange relationships within the family, which resulted in decreased family satisfaction and well-being.

Vignette 2. The good thing [that leaders do] would be to push the family support [group] program [Also] ... we have a good [job] safety program. We haven't had any accidents accidents for a period of time, and we got awards for it (Male staff sergeant with computers MOS).

The soldier perceives that his leader's power and behavior has had a positive impact on his family well-being. His leaders' behavior has involved advocating the family support group program and pushing the unit safety program. Both of these programs fall within the leaders' power to organize and manage. In the leader-soldier social exchange relationship, the leaders provide to the soldier inducements and social rewards that consist of consideration and esteem.

Presumably, the soldier's preconceived expectations and standards of leader consideration are that leaders should support Army programs that are beneficial to both soldiers and families. The reciprocal and fair exchange of leader consideration for soldier contributions, and the inherent meeting of the soldier's standards and expectations, leads to the soldier's expressed approval and satisfaction with his leader's power and behavior regarding these programs. Furthermore, these programs are perceived to have a positive impact on family well-being, because of the support network established by the family support group, and the safer working environment provided for soldiers.

Vignette 3. [The things my leaders do that affects my family are] ... poor planning, as far as duration of field training exercises, the time of the field training exercises, ... SD [special duty] ... TDY [temporary duty]

.... In the unit I was in, even though a guy [I know] would be SD up to the hospital, he still had to come back to the unit for certain of our call-outs and inspections. What little time he had home with family wasn't prime time ... He can't go enjoy his free time He still had to worry about his old job back in the unit ... because an IG [inspection] is coming up When you're SD you're still responsible [for your old job] ... [Leaders responsible for this include] platoon sergeant up to ... company commander ... and sergeant major (Male sergeant who is a medic).

The soldier perceives that leader behavior in certain instances can adversely impact on family well-being, such as when leader planning of training is perceived to be poor, and when soldiers are sent on special duty and still required to perform their job back on the unit. Based on past experience, this soldier probably holds certain standards and expectations for proper planning of training events by leaders. Furthermore, the soldier values the respect leaders provide for soldier time. The soldier's standards and expectations failed to be met, resulting in his disapproval of leader behavior. In addition, the soldier perceives that the norms of reciprocity and fairness are violated by leaders, who are not respecting soldier time

as well as they could and making illegitimate demands upon soldiers.

The soldier perceives therefore that leader behavior has a negative impact on family well-being, due to the increased amount of time a soldier must spend away from family to meet work or field exercise requirements. This vignette demonstrates how a violation of Blau's reciprocity principle, the imposition of illegitimate demands, and the falling short of soldier expectations can result in soldier perceptions that leader behavior negatively impacts on family well-being.

Vignette 4. In Germany we had like a precombat inspection. We did the inspection, we went to the field, we came back ... we cleaned our equipment ... [and] the colonel gave you off. But over here ... they got a little saying, once the train starts up, ... it don't stop, ... you're constantly doing something. You never have hardly any time for your family cause you're always on the go. You never get off ... before like 6 o'clock ... [and often] you may not get off 'til like 7, 8 o'clock ... and it caused a few problems with my wife (Male staff sergeant in the infantry).

Here, the soldier perceives that his leaders' demands have caused him to stay so busy that he has little time for his family. Moreover, his hours have been such that they have caused problems within the family. The leaders' behavior involves keeping the soldiers continually training or performing maintenance, or busy in some way. The soldier had been in a unit in Germany where his leaders were quite considerate of his time by giving him time off after hard work and long hours of field duty. His standard for evaluation of his current unit and his expectations are based upon his experience in Germany and he feels deprived relative to soldiers in other units.

In a social exchange relationship between leaders and soldiers, leaders might provide the social reward of consideration and predictability of time off to soldiers. Here, the soldier perceived that leaders had exchanged little consideration with him. The soldier's perception of a violation of the norm of fairness in the exchange between unit leaders and himself, and a failure of the leaders to meet the soldier's expectations for consideration, resulted in the soldier's disapproval of the leaders' behavior and his concomitant dissatisfaction with the impact that they were having on his family. The soldier perceived that the leaders' behavior had a negative impact on his family's well-being because of the reduced time he had to spend with

his wife and family on account of deployment separations and long hours.

Vignette 5. [In Germany] the wives they didn't get together and hardly do anything ... they wasn't try[ing] to call you to do anything like the wives here We had a lot of problems there ... we was younger then I had two little babies ... I stayed on the economy ... [In the unit] all they [the leaders] want[ed] to say is he'll [the soldier will] do better if you go [back to the states] ... that wasn't true ... that's not what neither one of us wanted ... that caused a lot of problems in our marriage ... they did send me back to the states ... that was terrible ... they [his leaders] figured it was all me ... it was a lot of pressure, nobody to talk to, no where to go (Wife of a staff sergeant; staff sergeant is an infantryman).

The spouse recounts with disapproval the lack of consideration that unit leaders had for her and her children's welfare when she was a young mother living off post in Germany. The soldier was fairly junior then also and was not experienced enough to look properly after the welfare of his family or to insure that military community support services would do so.

The spouse perceived that the leaders' behavior involved not supporting her through facilitating wives' functions where she could get involved, and also through pressing for her return to the U.S. The spouse's prior expectations were that unit leaders would provide the social rewards necessary for her and her family's welfare. She valued the social reward of acceptance and esteem.

The spouse perceived that the leaders and their wives provided little consideration in exchange for the soldier's instrumental contributions at work. Apparently, there was an imbalance in the exchange relationships, and the spouse's needs failed to be met, which led to her dissatisfaction with the leaders' behavior. Ostensibly, she believed that her family well-being suffered because of the hardships of living on the German economy with little unit social support and the separation from her husband following the return to the U.S.

Vignette 6. [My husband was sent back to his original unit] ... it's a line company. There's a lot of prejudice in that company. I almost divorced him They gave him a lot of hassle, there was a lot of prejudice, and you knew it. The only bad thing about it is it's hard to prove prejudice. It got to the point where he was very short of patience ... didn't have time for [the kids] I

mean we was arguing all the time I left home I couldn't stand it anymore They transferred him over to [another unit, and things greatly improved] (Wife of a sergeant first class; sergeant first class serves in an armor MOS).

The spouse was quite dissatisfied and affected by the apparent prejudicial behavior tolerated by leaders in the line company, which she perceived to have adversely affected her husband's behavior. The soldier's behavior in response to the perceived prejudice involved a lack of patience with his wife and children, and less time spent with the family. The leader behavior, though not explicitly specified, was perceived to involve the toleration of actions in the unit that were prejudicial in nature.

The soldier and spouse did not expect the line company to have a problem with prejudice, nor for the problems to affect their family well-being so drastically. Prejudice was obviously viewed by them as a pernicious problem. In the leader-soldier exchange relationship, the spouse perceived that the leaders did not provide or facilitate the social rewards of acceptance, approval, and esteem for the soldier.

The perceived imbalance in the exchange relationship, and failure of the leaders' behavior to approach soldier and spouse expectations for approval and esteem, resulted in

the spouse's dissatisfaction with her family well-being. In the social exchange relationships within the family, the soldier failed to meet the emotional needs of the spouse and children during the time he served in the line company in exchange for the spouse's contributions, such as esteem, companionship, and sharing of childrearing responsibilities. The imbalance in the exchange, combined with the lack of time the soldier spent with his children, had a negative impact on family well-being, according to the spouse.

Vignette 7. We've been to a couple ... [of unit social functions]. They [his leaders] come up to you ... they're so glad to meet me ... and [they say] do I know how valuable this guy [my husband] is. That is so sickening ... I don't believe they give a ... [damn] what I think, not really. You can't tell me they really care what the wife thinks. I mean it was nice to say and all that, and you smile and go on your way, but I don't believe all that crap (Wife of a sergeant; sergeant's MOS is finance).

In this vignette, the spouse expresses her disapproval with leader behavior that is perceived to be insincere or false. The leader behavior, as described by the spouse, involves expressing to the soldier's wife how much he

appreciates the contributions of the soldier to the unit. The spouse values the social rewards of expressed esteem and social approval from her husband's leader, which she received directly from the leader at a unit social function. Concomitantly, the spouse expects sincerity and veracity in the comments from the leader.

The exchange relationship involves the leader providing social approval through compliments to the spouse in exchange for the soldier's work contributions. The spouse apparently believes that there is reciprocity and fairness in the exchange relationship, however, her perception of leader sincerity does not meet her expectations, perhaps because of the status inequality built into the leader-soldier relationship, which makes the leader appear to be condescending. As a result of the shortfall in expectations, the spouse appears to question the extent to which the leader really cares about family well-being.

Chapter VI - Discussion and Conclusion

Discussion

Drawing upon the analysis of the interview responses, there are several main points to be learned about how soldiers and spouses perceive the impact of leader power and behavior on their family well-being. These main points will be explained in two ways. First, a synopsis of the social exchange relationships will be presented which will show how Blau's theory accounted for perceptions of the ways that leader power and behavior impacted positively or negatively upon family well-being. Second, an organizing typology will be presented in order to illustrate the substantive experiences of soldiers and spouses, the perceived leader power and behavior, and the perceived impact on family well-being. By way of summarizing the main points to be learned from the social exchange relationships, soldiers and spouses were likely to perceive that leader power and behavior in a given incident or experience had either a positive or negative impact upon their family well-being.

The qualitative analysis shows that perceptions of a positive impact likely occurred when one or more of these conditions existed: first, the norms of reciprocity and fairness were fulfilled in the exchange of leader inducements or social rewards for soldier contributions; second, soldier or spouse expectations of social rewards were met or exceeded; third, leader behavior or social rewards were

consistent with soldier or spouse values or standards; fourth, soldiers had valued the inducements received from their leaders and provided more contributions in order for the leaders to increase inducements; fifth, leader reward power was exercised; and sixth, leader demands were perceived to be fair or legitimate (Blau, 1964).

On the other hand, the analysis reflects many other incidents and experiences where leader power and behavior were perceived to have had a negative impact on family well-being. The perceptions of a negative impact usually occurred when one or more of the following cases existed: first, there was a violation of the norms of reciprocity and fairness in the exchange of leader inducements or social rewards for soldier contributions; second, soldier or spouse expectations of social rewards were not met; third, leader behavior or social rewards were inconsistent with soldier or spouse values or standards; fourth, stability in relations between leaders and the soldier was traded off by leaders for stability or balance in exchange relations between leaders and senior noncommissioned officers; fifth, leader coercive power was exercised; and sixth, leader demands were perceived to be unfair or illegitimate (Blau, 1964).

Given an understanding of the main points learned about the perceptions of leader power and behavior from an exchange relationship standpoint, it is worthwhile next to summarize soldiers' and spouses' reported incidents or

experiences involving leaders, their perceptions of leader power and behavior, and their perceptions of the impact on family well-being. The next portion consists of an organizing typology of soldier and spouse perceptions, and incidents or experiences they have had with their leaders. The incidents are reported as the soldiers or spouses told them, and no attempt has been made to establish further accuracy, or to present the leaders' side of the story.

Typology

Incident or
Experience
Leading to
Soldier or
Spouse
Perceptions

Perceptions of
Leader Power
and Behavior

Perceived
Impact on
Family
Well-Being

A) Leader Power and Behavior Perceived as Positively Impacting on Family Well-Being:

Leaders
supportive
of soldier
problems,
especially
reinlistment

Concerned and
helpful

Soldier's
reenlist-
ment afford-
ed the family
security

Leader
assisted
spouse while
soldier was
in hospital

Considerate and
involved

Spouse
cared for
and family
morale
improved

Leaders insure
spouses are
called and
notified
about late
soldiers

Caring and
informative

Predictability
of family
schedule
improved;
Avoided worry
over soldier
safety

Incident or
Experience
Leading to
Soldier or
Spouse
Perceptions

Perceptions of
Leader Power
and Behavior

Perceived
Impact on
Family
Well-Being

Leaders
recommended
soldier for
promotion

Esteeming and
rewarding

Increased
income and
status

Leaders gave
soldiers time
off for important
or essential
family needs

Fair and
accepting

Improved
family wel-
fare and
cohesion

Leaders
arranged a unit
party for sol-
diers, spouses,
and children

Leader time and
effort spent on
a beneficial
purpose

Soldier,
spouse, and
children
enjoyed the
party

Enlisted
evaluation
report on
soldier
was encour-
aging and
constructive

Approving and
esteeming

Family's
satisfaction
enhanced
through
soldier's
expressed
satisfaction
with his job

Leaders
release
soldiers
from duty
on time

Reasonable
and considerate

Affords
soldiers
sufficient
and predict-
able time
with family

Leaders
endorse the
family sup-
port group
program

Concerned with
family welfare

Enhanced
morale and
feelings of
social
support

Incident or
Experience
Leading to
Soldier or
Spouse
Perceptions

Perceptions of
Leader Power
and Behavior

Perceived
Impact on
Family
Well-Being

Leaders
endorse the
unit safety
program

Concerned with
soldier welfare

Avoided
concern
for soldier's
safety

B) Leader Power and Behavior Perceived as Negatively
Impacting on Family Well-Being:

Leader
initially
denied
soldier's
leave request
to care for
sick child

Lack of
consideration

Child's
health and
emotions
would have
been nega-
tively
affected

Soldier not
included in
leader and
senior NCO
social
activities

Inequality
in attention
and rewards
given to
soldiers

Family not
able to
derive bene-
fit of social
events

Leader required
soldier to go
away to school

Lack of con-
sideration of
family needs

Decline in
child's
school grades

Leader has bad
attitude, is
very competitive
and misplaces
work priorities

Concerned
more with
style than
substance

Soldier comes
home troubled

Incident or
Experience
Leading to
Soldier or
Spouse
Perceptions

Perceptions of
Leader Power
and Behavior

Perceived
Impact on
Family
Well-Being

Leader denied
soldier's
request for
time off to be
with wife in
hospital

Lack of
caring

Expense of a
babysitter
required;
wife not
supported at
stressful
time

Leaders
notified
soldier on
a weekend to
work that
weekend

Illegitimate
request

Family time
impinged upon

Leaders wait
until late in
day to specify
work which must
be done that
day, when sol-
diers idle all
day

Lack of Con-
sideration
and poor
planning

Soldier has
less time
to spend
with family

Leaders send
soldiers back
to work on
weekends when
work could
wait until
Monday

Poor planning
involved; and
unfair request

Soldier is
not able
to meet family
needs or his
needs for
time with
family

Leader was
overbearing
with soldier

Lack of esteeming

Soldier came
home in a bad
mood which
affected
family morale

Incident or
Experience
Leading to
Soldier or
Spouse
Perceptions

Perceptions of
Leader Power
and Behavior

Perceived
Impact on
Family
Well-Being

Leaders blame
soldier for
things going
wrong

Coercive power
used

Soldier comes
home mad and
yells at
children

Leader denied
soldier's
opportunity
to attend
school

Unfair denial
of career
enhancing
school

Family could
not reap
benefit of
soldier's
career
enhancement

Soldier crew
rest periods
violated by
leaders

Noncompliance
with standards
of safety and
fairness

Soldier was
fatigued and
had little
time for
family

Leaders unable
to secure
compassionate
reassignment
for soldier
and family

Concerned but
not helpful;
higher head-
quarters
unresponsive
to leaders'
requests

Set back
family
welfare
and morale

Leaders call
soldier's home
at 4 am and
blame soldier
for failure
to be at a
work tasking

Illegitimate
request and lack
of consideration

Reduced
predictability
of family
schedule

Leader depends
on soldier
to do parts of
leader's job

Lack of expert
power

Caused stress
in soldier
and family

Incident or
Experience
Leading to
Soldier or
Spouse
Perceptions

Perceptions of
Leader Power
and Behavior

Perceived
Impact on
Family
Well-Being

Leaders require
soldier to per-
form job back
in unit while
on special duty

Inconsiderate
of soldier's
time

Soldier
unable to
spend time
with family

Leaders impose
demands on
soldier
time and
require long
hours at work

Little respect
for soldier's
time

Caused
problems
between spouse
and soldier

Leaders
pressed
spouse to
return to
U.S. from
overseas

Lack of
support of
spouse

Caused
marital
problems

Prejudice
existed in
unit

Lack of respect
and acceptance

Soldier
short of
time and
patience
with family
members

Leader
insincere
in compliments
to spouse
about
soldier

Little genuine
concern; just
politics

Family
well-being
is not
truly
supported
by leader

Conclusion

The discussion above provides an understanding of the main points learned about the social exchange relationships and the perceptions of the impact of leader power and behavior on military family well-being. Besides these lessons and perceptions, there are several themes which emerge from the analysis of the perceptions.

First, the analysis of the interview responses has shown that when soldiers and spouses perceived their leaders' behavior as involving consideration, that is, caring, concern, esteeming, acceptance, and reasonableness in demands, among others, the perception of leader impact on family well-being was most likely positive. Conversely, when perceptions pointed to a lack of consideration, for example, unfairness, poor planning, lack of esteeming, or unexpected punishments, leaders were perceived to have a negative impact on family well-being.

Second, the extent of adherence to, or violation of, the norms of reciprocity and fairness in the exchange of leader social rewards for soldier compliance in many cases determined whether leader impact on family well-being was perceived to be positive or negative, respectively. For instance, when a leader grants a soldier time off to attend an important family event in exchange for long hours worked by the soldier during the previous week, this is likely to be perceived as having a positive impact on family well-

being, while the failure to grant the time off might result in perceptions of a negative impact on family well-being.

Third, the prior values and expectations of soldiers or spouses determined whether they perceived social rewards offered by leaders as having a positive or negative impact on family well-being. When social rewards are expected and valued by soldiers or spouses, and leaders provide these rewards, it is likely that the rewards will have a positive impact on family well-being, while rewards that run counter to values or expectations might result in a negative impact on family well-being.

Fourth, the interview responses seemed to indicate that soldiers and spouses lacked control or volition regarding the demands made on them and their time by their leaders. This lack of volition implied the extensive degree of either positive or negative influence which soldiers and spouses perceived their leaders had over the well-being of their families.

Fifth, military personnel encounter the same spillover of work experiences into their family lives as their civilian counterparts, and perhaps to a greater degree due to the demands of the military, which include long hours, weekend work, and separations. More often than not, these demands are perceived by soldiers and spouses as having mainly a negative impact on family well-being because of the time soldiers are required to spend away from family.

Sixth, the utilization of Blau's structural exchange theory is an appropriate and excellent means to explain and foster an understanding of the dynamics in the exchange relationships between leaders and soldiers and within the family. The theory accounts for dynamics in a social exchange relationship clearly and in depth, and offers numerous aspects or components from which to conceptualize and understand the dynamics. Furthermore, it enables the addition of knowledge about the perceptions of the impact of leader power and behavior on family well-being to existing research in the sociology of work and family.

These aforementioned themes, combined with the main points learned from the social exchange relationships and the perceptions of leader power and behavior and family well-being, will serve in the future as guidelines for the teaching of leadership and family welfare to audiences which include leaders, soldiers and their families, military family researchers, and military policymakers. A review of each of these points learned and each of the experiences and perceptions presented in the typology would serve as an effective method for instruction on how leader power and behavior might impact on family well-being. The utility of guidelines for instruction derived from this thesis is enhanced by the fact that they have come personally from the experiences and incidents of soldiers and spouses.

The significance of the perceptions of junior noncom-

missioned officers cannot be overstated because these soldiers represent an important segment of the Army (Segal, 1987a). Soldiers in pay grades E4 - E6 constitute the majority of Army enlisted personnel, while the majority of them are also married (Defense Manpower Data Center, 1986a). Furthermore, it is worthwhile to study the well-being of Army families because family satisfaction and quality of life are very likely to impact upon soldier retention and readiness.

References

- Bass, Bernard M. 1981. Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership. New York: Free Press.
- Blau, Peter M. 1964. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: Wiley.
- Campbell, Angus. 1981. The Sense of Well-Being in America. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, and Willard E. Rogers. 1976. The Quality of American Life. New York: Russell Sage.
- Csoka, Louis S. 1984. "Leadership and Organizational Outcomes." In Leadership in Organizations. Ed. Howard T. Prince et al. 2nd ed. West Point: U.S. Military Academy, pp. 13-1 - 13-45.
- Defense Manpower Data Center. 1986a. Description of Officer and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces: 1985. Volume I, Supplementary Tabulations from the 1985 DOD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel. Arlington, Va.: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Defense Manpower Data Center. 1986b. Description of Officer and Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces: 1985. Volume III, Supplementary Tabulations from the 1985 DOD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel. Arlington, Va.: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Emerson, Richard M. 1976. "Social Exchange Theory." In Annual Review of Sociology. Ed. A. Inkeles and N. Smelser, Vol. 2. Palo Alto, Ca.: Annual Reviews, pp. 335-362.
- French, John R.P., Jr., and Bertram Raven. 1959. "The Bases of Social Power." In Studies in Social Power. Ed. Dorwin Cartwright. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, pp. 150-167.
- French, John R.P., Jr., and Richard Snyder. 1959. "Leadership and Interpersonal Power." In Studies in Social Power. Ed. Dorwin Cartwright. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, pp. 118-149.

- Halpin, Andrew W. and B. James Winer. 1957. "A Factorial Study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions." In Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Ed. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons. Columbus, Oh.: Ohio State University, pp. 39-51.
- Homans, George C. 1950. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Homans, George C. 1961. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Jacobs, Thomas O. 1970. Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations. Alexandria, Va.: Human Resources Research Organization.
- Kahn, Robert L., et al. 1964. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: Wiley.
- Little, Roger W. 1971. "The Military Family." In Handbook of Military Institutions. Ed. Roger W. Little. Beverly Hills: Sage, pp. 247-270.
- March, James G. and Herbert A. Simon. 1958. Organizations. New York: Wiley.
- McCubbin, Hamilton I., Barbara B. Dahl, and Edna J. Hunter. 1976. "Research on the Military Family: A Review." In Families in the Military System. Ed. Hamilton I. McCubbin, Barbara B. Dahl, and Edna J. Hunter. 1st ed. Beverly Hills: Sage, pp. 291-319.
- Nice, D. Stephen. 1978. "The Androgynous Wife and the Military Child." In Children of Military Families. Ed. Edna J. Hunter and D. Stephen Nice. 1st ed. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 24-37.
- Repetti, Rena L. 1987a. "Individual and Common Components of the Social Environment at Work and Psychological Well-Being." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 710-720.
- _____. 1987b. "Linkages Between Work and Family Roles." In Applied Social Psychology Annual. Ed. S. Oskamp. Vol. 2. Beverly Hills: Sage, pp. 98-127.
- Ritzer, George and David Walczak. 1986. Working: Conflict and Change. Englewood, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

- Rossi, Peter H. and Howard E. Freeman. 1985. Evaluation: A Systemic Approach. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Schuessler, K. F. and G.A. Fisher. 1985. "Quality of Life Research and Sociology." In Annual Review of Sociology. Ed. Ralph H. Turner and James F. Short, Jr. Vol. 11. Palo Alto, Ca.: Annual Reviews, pp. 129-149.
- Segal, Mady W. 1986a. "Enlisted Family Life in the U.S. Army: A Portrait of a Community." In Life in the Rank and File. Ed. David R. Segal and H. Wallace Sinaiko. 1st ed. Washington, D.C.: Pergamon-Brassey's, pp. 184-211.
- _____. 1986b. "The Military and the Family as Greedy Institutions." Armed Forces and Society. 13 (Fall 1986), 9-39.
- _____. 1986c. Plan for Research on Army Families. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Research Institute.
- _____. 1987a. "Social Belonging and Well-being in an Army Family Community: Stability and Change over Time." Research Protocol. Silver Spring, Md.: Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.
- _____. 1987b. [Soldier/Spouse] Interview. Silver Spring, Md.: Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.
- Shaw, Marvin E. and Philip R. Costanzo. 1982. Theories of Social Psychology. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Stanton, M. Duncan. 1976. "The Military Family: Its Future in the All-Volunteer Context." In The Social Psychology of Military Service. Ed. Nancy L. Goldman and David R. Segal. 1st ed. Beverly Hills: Sage, pp. 135-150.
- Thibaut, J.W. and H.H. Kelley. 1959. The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: Wiley.
- Van Vranken, E. et al. 1984. The Impact of Deployment Separation on Army Families. Washington, D.C.: Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.
- Weber, Max. 1968. Economy and Society. New York: Bedminster.

Wickham, John A., Jr. 1983. Chief of Staff White Paper
1983: The Army Family. Washington, D.C.:
Department of the Army.

Yukl, Gary A. 1981. Leadership in Organizations. Engle-
wood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.